

take vigorous exception to that ruling. In our view, the CAB has failed in its obligation to act in the public interest in this matter.

Congressman Ottinger has pointedly reminded the CAB of the spanking that the Federal Power Commission got from the Second Circuit Court of Appeals when it similarly rebuffed a group of independent citizens seeking to protect the public interest against the construction of a hydroelectric project at Storm King Mountain. The CAB may be inviting a similar rebuke. It denied the right of citizens to intervene in the case before it in the interests of maintaining a tolerable urban environment on the ground that the complainants' interests "are not so substantial as to require or warrant intervention by them."

But in the Storm King case the Court of Appeals said that a showing of "economic

injury" was not necessary to intervention "where the plaintiffs have shown a direct personal interest." The Court sharply reminded the FPC of its claim to be representative of the public interest. It then went on to say:

This role does not permit it to act as an umpire blandly calling balls and strikes for adversaries; the right of the public must receive active and affirmative protection at the hands of the Commission.

The Transportation Department has taken a similar view, "that a consideration of the environmental impact of common carrier operations is a relevant and important factor to be weighed in determining whether in a particular proceeding the public convenience and necessity require authorization of the proposed service."

Instead of actively and affirmatively protecting the public interest here, the CAB has

attempted to wash its hands of the noise and fallout menace. Instead of looking at the issue on its merits, it has simply closed its eyes and ears. In these circumstances there is no alternative to pressing the case before the courts and before Congress until relief is forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, legislation is needed to place the airlines on notice that the Federal Government is serious about noise abatement. The courts have held jet noise to be a national problem and a national responsibility.

If a quiet engine were available tomorrow, there is no way the Federal Government could require its use by the airlines. That authority must be placed on the books now.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the fresh mercies of yet another day we come with hearts grateful for Thy grace, praying that, by a strength not our own, our individual record may be kept unstained by any word or act unworthy of our best.

Thou knowest that these testing times are finding out our every weakness and calling for our utmost endeavor against the wrong that needs resistance, and for the right that needs assistance.

We come claiming the promise that they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings of eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint.

Girded by Thy might, give us the courage to fly, the urgency to run, and the patience to walk.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 12, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 11, 1967:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blakenships; and

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

On October 12, 1967:

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing

quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 2162. An act to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7977) to adjust certain postage rates, to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and to regulate the mailing of pandering advertisements, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7977) to adjust certain postage rates, to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and to regulate the mailing of pandering advertisements, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees

be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HARRIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the completion of the transaction of routine morning business, the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HARTKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendars Nos. 590 and 621.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMDR. ALBERT G. BERRY, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2757) for the relief of Comdr. Albert G. Berry, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "of" strike out "pay

and allowances" and insert "retired pay"; on page 2, line 7, after the word "of" strike out "pay and allowances" and insert "retired pay"; and in line 9, after the word "such" strike out "pay and allowances" and insert "retired pay".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 607), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to authorize the payment to Albert G. Berry, Jr., U.S. Naval Reserve (retired), of the amount certified by the Comptroller General as the difference between the retired pay he received in the period from February 1, 1947, through October 7, 1952, and the amount he should have received had he been properly credited with his midshipman's service for retired pay purposes.

STATEMENT

The House committee, in reporting on H.R. 2757, relates the following:

The Department of the Navy in its report to the committee on the bill indicated that it supported the bill and suggested the amendment made by the committee providing for certification by the Comptroller General.

The period Commander Berry served as a midshipman at the Naval Academy from July 6, 1910, to June 5, 1914, is creditable in the computation of his retired pay by virtue of the provisions of the act of March 4, 1913, now codified in section 6116 of title 10, United States Code. The report of the Department of the Navy makes reference to the Joint Service Pay Act of June 10, 1922, the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and the Career Compensation Act of 1949, which also contain provisions concerning the credit of midshipman service during this period. The effect of these provisions were that commissioned officers of the Navy who retired after July 1, 1922, were not entitled to include Naval Academy midshipman service performed under appointments made prior to March 4, 1913, in the computation of basic pay unless they had been in service on June 30, 1922. Commander Berry was in service as a commissioned officer in the Regular Navy on that date. At this point, it is pertinent to outline the service performed by Commander Berry which ultimately entitled him to the payment of retired pay.

Commander Berry served as a midshipman at the Naval Academy from July 6, 1910, to June 5, 1914, and as a commissioned officer in the Regular Navy from June 6, 1914, to February 15, 1926, when he resigned from the Navy. He was appointed a commissioned officer in the Naval Reserve on April 6, 1926, and resigned therefrom effective March 23, 1933. During this period of Reserve service he performed active duty for training during the period April 9, 1926, to May 8, 1926, May 29, 1926, to June 13, 1926, and May 10, 1928, to May 19, 1928. He was again appointed a commissioned officer in the Naval Reserve on January 3, 1941, performed active duty for training from February 11, 1941, to February 24, 1941, entered on full-time active duty on February 25, 1941, and served continuously on active duty until February 1, 1947, when he was transferred to the Naval Reserve retired list upon his own application under

authority contained in section 6 of the act of February 21, 1946, 34 U.S.C. 410b (voluntary retirement after completion of more than 20 years of active service, including active duty for training, of which at least 10 years was service as a commissioned officer). Section 7 of the act of February 21, 1946 (34 U.S.C. 410c), provided that an officer who is retired under the provisions of section 6 of that act was entitled to retired pay computed at the rate of 2½ percent of his basic pay at the time of retirement, multiplied by the total years of service credited to him for the purpose of computing his active duty basic pay and, further, in determining the multiplier a part of a year that is 6 months or more counts as a whole year while a part of a year that is less than 6 months is disregarded.

The difficulties in this case and the aspect of the matter which in the opinion of the committee justifies legislative relief is that Commander Berry was able to establish his right to include midshipman's service in the computation of his retired pay only after extended efforts which included litigation in the Court of Claims. Apparently, he was originally unable to secure the credit due to the fact that the Comptroller General took the position that the right to credit midshipman service for basic pay purposes was lost to any officer who, after June 30, 1922, resigned his commission and subsequently after a break in service accepted a new commission in the Navy or Naval Reserve. This Comptroller General ruling was in effect at the time of Commander Berry's retirement in 1947. Thus, although he had a total of 28 years 7 months 26 days of service, including his midshipman service of 3 years 11 months, which would have provided retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of basic pay by 29 (72½%), his retired pay was based on total service (not including midshipman service) of 24 years 8 months 26 days, resulting in entitlement to retired pay computed at the rate of 2½ percent of basic pay by 25 (62½%).

Subsequent to his retirement Commander Berry filed a petition in the Court of Claims (a) for certain active duty pay and allowances for service performed prior to his retirement, and (b) the difference between the retired pay actually received by him beginning February 1, 1947, computed on the basis of 62½ percent of basic pay at time of retirement pursuant to the provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the act of February 21, 1946, and retired pay computed on the basis of 75 percent of his basic pay at time of retirement under the provisions of paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (which provided that certain officers of the Armed Forces who served on active duty prior to November 12, 1942, would, upon retirement, be entitled to retired pay computed at the rate of 75 percent of basic pay). The Court of Claims allowed him the active duty pay and allowances he had claimed, but denied him his claim for increased retired pay. (*Albert G. Berry, Jr. v. United States*, Ct. Cl. No. 49288, decided Oct. 7, 1952.)

In March 1959, Commander Berry petitioned the Court of Claims for increased retired pay (72½ percent of basic pay vice 62½ percent) based on the inclusion of his midshipman service as service creditable for pay purposes and on October 13, 1961, a decision was rendered by the court allowing him the increase beginning March 1, 1953. (The Court of Claims may grant retroactive benefits for a period of only 6 years from date of filing a petition.)

Subsequent to October 13, 1961, Commander Berry filed a claim with the Comptroller General for increased retired pay (72½ percent vice 62½ percent) for the period February 1, 1947, to February 28, 1953. On February 7, 1962, he was paid the increased retired pay for the period October 8, 1952, to

February 28, 1953. Since the first Court of Claims decision in his case was rendered on October 7, 1952, and covered a period back to February 1, 1947, the Comptroller General disallowed his claim for increased retired pay prior to October 8, 1952, on the basis of the holding in the case of *Heiser v. Woodruff, et al.*, 327 U.S. 726. In that case the Supreme Court held that in general a judgment is res judicata not only as to all matters litigated and decided but also to all relevant issues which could have been, but were not raised and litigated in the suit.

As has been noted in the foregoing paragraph, the refusal of the Comptroller General to pay the amount called for in this bill is not due to any question of his entitlement to pay upon this basis, for that has been clearly defined by court decision. It merely relates to the fact that in his original proceeding in the Court of Claims, this point was not raised. However, as has been noted, the court in the action filed in 1959 directed that he was entitled to credit for his midshipman's service and granted him retroactive relief for a 6-year period. The committee has on previous occasions granted similar relief where the rights of the parties were determined in court proceedings. Since there is no question concerning Commander Berry's right to credit for his midshipman's service and the fact that he is presently receiving credit for this service in the payment of his retired pay, it is recommended that the bill, with the amendment suggested by the Navy that the determination be made by the Comptroller General of the amount due him, be considered favorably.

After full consideration of all of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives, and recommends that the bill, H.R. 2757, as amended, be considered favorably.

According to information received from the Comptroller General of the United States, the amount involved in this bill is \$3,870.43.

GILMOUR C. MACDONALD, COLONEL, USAF

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10932) for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 10, strike out:

SEC. 3. No attorney shall charge, demand, receive, or collect for services rendered, fees in excess of 10 per centum of any judgment rendered pursuant to this Act. Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with such claim any amount in excess of that allowed under this section, if recovery be had, shall be fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 638), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to waive any statute of limitations and confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any legal claim filed by Gilmour C.

MacDonald for compensation for the use during World War II and the Korean conflict of a tubular caltrop tire-puncturing device allegedly invented by him.

STATEMENT

In the 89th Congress, H.R. 7546 was passed by the Congress and sent to the President for his approval. The President, however, vetoed that bill on the ground that the bill would confer upon the Court of Claims jurisdiction to render judgment upon an equitable claim, indicating that equitable jurisdiction in the Court of Claims was not delegable by the Congress. Copy of the veto message is herein set forth:

To the House of Representatives:

I regret that I must return without my approval H.R. 7546, a bill for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired), which would, in part, confer upon the Court of Claims jurisdiction to render judgment upon an equitable claim.

The Acting Attorney General has advised me that this bill is unconstitutional. In his opinion, in the special sphere of private claims, equitable connotes what the Government should do as a matter of moral, as distinguished from legal, responsibility; as a constitutional court, the Court of Claims cannot receive and exercise such a jurisdiction, and the power to determine what the Government should do in such circumstances is legislative in nature and non-delegable.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 10, 1966.

The present bill, in order to meet the objection of the President, was introduced deleting the equitable provision that appeared in H.R. 7546 so that the instant legislation confers jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to consider this matter on a legal basis only. The House report in its favorable action on H.R. 7546 of the 89th Congress relates the facts in this case as follows:

"The bill, H.R. 7546, was the subject of a subcommittee hearing on June 9, 1966, at which time the subcommittee heard testimony in support of the bill and testimony in opposition by representatives of the Air Force. At that hearing the attorney for the claimant and the claimant himself testified as to the circumstances under which Mr. MacDonald disclosed his idea of a caltrop tire-puncturing device to the United States through the National Inventors Council. As is noted in the Department of the Air Force report, on September 30, 1940, the National Inventors Council received a letter from Gilmour C. MacDonald suggesting a design for a tubular caltrop device to be used for military purposes. Enclosed with the letter were photographs of the device. At the time of this submission Mr. MacDonald had not yet entered upon active duty with the Army. The Air Force report further noted that on November 25, 1940, the claimant also submitted a similar letter with photographs of the same device to the Field Service Section, Material Division of the Army Corps at Wright Field, Ohio.

"The information submitted to the committee and the exhibits of the device displayed to the committee at the hearing established the fact that a caltrop is a four-pointed metal device so constructed that three of the points form a base on the ground and the other sharpened point extends directly upward. Colonel MacDonald's design was constructed of tubular material for the purpose of deflating the tires of enemy vehicles or aircraft. One of the points relied upon by Colonel MacDonald in connection with his claim is that the tubular construction could cause tire deflation even if there was a self-sealing feature to the tire.

"The Air Force report details the circumstances and some of the history concerning the matter and it is apparent that Colonel MacDonald has over the year sought to as-

sert his claim by some administrative action; however, the Air Force report observed that as far back as 1948, the review of the matter by the Departments of the Air Force and Army resulted in the determination that there was no apparent statutory authority to settle the claim. However, the committee feels that this course of action shows that Colonel MacDonald was diligent in seeking to maintain his right to claim compensation and that, therefore, the committee is justified in recommending a waiver of any applicable statute of limitations which might be asserted to bar his claim.

"The committee feels that a jurisdictional bill is the only fair and logical way to resolve this matter. There are difficult legal and factual questions concerning the claim which can best be resolved by the Court of Claims. Each year that court considers a large number of claims involving patents and it is, therefore, logical that this forum be selected for the consideration of this case."

The committee believes that H.R. 10932, as amended, meets the objection of the President and recommends that the bill be considered favorably.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 12, 1967,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on October 12, 1967, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 985. An act for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.;

H.R. 678. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3973. An act to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 3979. An act to amend section 6409(b) (1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General;

H.R. 10509. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11722. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the opportunity for savings by adopting manufacturers' recommended preventive maintenance programs for inter-agency motor pool vehicles, General Services Administration, dated October 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Leung Kong, from a report relating to

allens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on October 12, 1967 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATUE OF LIBERTY NATIONAL MONUMENT, N.Y.—PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a proposed concession contract under which Evelyn Hill, Inc., will be authorized to continue to operate eating and merchandising facilities for the public within the Statue of Liberty National Monument, N.Y., for a 10-year period from January 1, 1968, through December 31, 1977, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BOULDER BEACH, LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, NEV.—PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract under which Arvis C. and Anna L. Forrest, husband and wife, will be authorized to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at the Boulder Beach site of Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev., upon their purchase of the concession from Mr. and Mrs. Clarence W. Anderson, the present operators, from date of execution of contract through December 31, 1972 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE MEMORIAL 1615

"A memorial to the Florida congressional delegation requesting support for an expression of congressional and Florida legislative intent relating to the exclusive jurisdiction and control to be exercised by the state of Florida in the management of its freshwater resources

"Whereas, the legislature of the state of Florida, meeting in regular session at Tallahassee, Florida, desires to bring to the attention of the Florida congressional delegation the need for prompt and effective enunciation of the state's right and responsibility to manage and allocate its own freshwater resources, and

"Whereas, certain agencies of the federal government have claimed and continue to claim rights to fresh water which is captured, stored and managed within the geographical purview of the central and southern Florida flood control project, and

"Whereas, these claims purport to be based upon the congressional documents authorizing the central and southern Florida flood control project, and

"Whereas, there appears to be no legislative history whatsoever to support these claims, and

"Whereas, the assurances of local cooperation furnished by the state of Florida, its political subdivisions and its citizens were not undertaken with any intent to convey authority to any federal agency to allocate the fresh water in the state of Florida, and

"Whereas, the legislative and executive branches of the state of Florida are aware of and responsive to the need for providing a balanced program of water resources management and development in Florida, and

"Whereas, it is the desire of the legislature of the state of Florida that the state and its agencies continue progressive and positive water resources management programs ad-

ministered at the state level which give due consideration to all phases and needs for water use.

"Be It Resolved By the Legislature of the State of Florida: That the Florida congressional delegation be requested to advise all federal agencies which have any responsibility for water resources development that the state of Florida claims complete jurisdiction over, and shall continue to assert all rights to, the management, diversion, storage, and use of its freshwater resources, and that any other agency trying to create other such rights or the authority to allocate stored waters within the state be urged to discontinue these efforts.

"Be it further resolved that the Florida congressional delegation be requested to express its desire that federal participation in the area of water resources development be executed in accordance with the will of the Congress of the United States as expressed in congressional documents authorizing the various federal-state projects and in strict accord with the intent of the original authorizing state legislation.

"Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress.

"Approved by the Governor July 26 1967.
"Filed in Office Secretary of State July 27, 1967."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Philadelphia, Pa., relating to the building of a powerful merchant marine fleet to insure maximum fish production as an added source of food supply; to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, signed by William H. Holmstrom, member of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, favoring the enactment of legislation relating to the conservation and preservation of fisheries; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of all Rio Vista, the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors, of Stockton, and the City Council of the City of Sanoma, in the State of California, favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the City Council, Lorain, Ohio, relating to the abolishment of the U.S. electoral college system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by members of the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, of the State of Kansas, relating to the provision of jobs, housing, and education to solve the problems of American cities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. Res. 160. Resolution to extend greetings to the Congress of the Philippines on the 66th anniversary of the arrival of the Thoma-site teachers in the Philippines.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO STUDY THE ORIGIN OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FINANCED BY THE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res.

177); which under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 58, Ninetieth Congress, agreed to February 20, 1967 (authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to study the origin of research and development programs financed by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government), is hereby amended on page 3, line 16, by striking out "\$75,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$80,000".

PRINTING OF INTERIM REPORT ON NORWALK RIVER BASIN, CONNECTICUT AND NEW YORK (S. DOC. NO. 51)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], I presented a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated September 1, 1967, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Norwalk River Basin, Connecticut and New York, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF INTERIM REPORT ON AQUILLA RESERVOIR, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TEX. (S. DOC. NO. 52)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated September 19, 1966, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Aquilla Reservoir, Brazos River Basin, Tex., in partial response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:
S. 2532. A bill for the relief of Lap Sheng Wong; and

S. 2533. A bill for the relief of Chi Ming Lo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:
S. 2534. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Ray M. Hollenbeck, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2535. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the capitalization of certain costs incurred in planning

and developing citrus groves; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIBLE:
S. 2536. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and administer under the authority of the national park system a National Visitor Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 2537. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:
S. 2538. A bill for the relief of Wan Chi Shing, Wong Chi Tong, Cheung Chung Tong, and Kam Kai Ming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKE (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 2539. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and of foreign origin; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and Mr. COTTON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. BROOKE):

S. 2540. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:
S. 2541. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:
S.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to provide for an expanded and intensified effort to increase the accuracy and extend the time range of weather predictions and to request the President to take action so that the peoples of the United States derive, at the earliest possible time, the social and economic benefits that would accrue from achievement of this new level of capability in weather predictions; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 1 OF THE HEARINGS ENTITLED "PLANNING-PROGRAMING-BUDGETING"

Mr. JACKSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 176), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations four thousand additional copies of part

1 of the hearings entitled "Planning-Programming-Budgeting" held by its Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations during the first session of the Ninetieth Congress.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO STUDY THE ORIGIN OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FINANCED BY THE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 177) to provide additional funds to study the origin of research and development programs financed by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HARRIS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

NATIONAL VISITOR'S CENTER BILL

Mr. BIBLE, Mr. President, the Members of the Senate will recall that late in the 89th Congress we approved H.R. 14604, which became Public Law 89-790, creating a Study Commission to make a full and complete investigation and study of sites and plans to provide facilities and services for visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capital.

The Secretary of the Interior is named Chairman of this Commission in the law, and I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Interior Committee, have the honor to serve as a member with 11 other Senators and Representatives as well as agency heads and distinguished private citizens.

I now introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to put into effect the results of the work of the Study Commission. My measure is based on a bill for a similar purpose that has been introduced in the other body by the distinguished Representative from the 21st Illinois Congressional District, Hon. KENNETH J. GRAY, and incorporates the amendments recommended by the Department of the Interior to the House bill, H.R. 12603. Both my bill and Congressman GRAY's measure provide that the Visitors' Center shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior under the statutory authority for the national park system; but the bill I am introducing places primary responsibility for establishment of the Center on the Secretary. This assignment of initial responsibility seems desirable to me, since the Secretary will have the burden of operating the Center once it is in being.

I commend the Visitors' Center measure to the attention of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2536) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and administer under the authority of the national park system a National Visitor Center, and for other purposes, intro-

duced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A NEW ERA FOR WORLD WEATHER

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am introducing today a joint resolution on the world weather program. Through this measure, the voice, and the sense of the Congress will be heard throughout the world, stating clearly that the United States supports this international, cooperative, scientific endeavor.

In 1964, President Johnson, speaking at Holy Cross College, said:

We will move ahead with plans to devise a worldwide weather system . . . By working together, on a global basis, we can take new strides toward coping with the historic enemies of storm and drought and flood.

Since that time, the President has reaffirmed his interest and his support for this vital international activity.

What is the world weather program? Why is it important? I shall try to answer the second question first.

For many groups and individuals the weather directly affects their livelihood, their economic well-being. These include farmers, shippers, manufacturers, retailers, those in the tourist industry, and many others.

On some occasions, weather poses a direct threat to life itself, or a threat to their personal future. In a typical year, in this country alone about 1,000 lives are lost through natural disasters related to weather. Property damage amounts to about a billion dollars annually on the average, and this year it will be far greater.

Hurricane-induced rains have brought floods ravaging the Rio Grande Valley and a northern Mexico-south Texas area the size of Indiana, bringing death and devastation and causing the evacuation of thousands. And just a short time ago floods devastated the city of Fairbanks, Alaska.

The benefits to the United States that can be obtained from a world weather program are not only defensive, that is, increased protection from the threats and hazards of weather. There are positive benefits to be gained. Eventually we want to tap the material resources of the oceans. We want to increase the world's ability to produce food for its growing population. We will be spending more and more of our efforts on the problem of air and water pollution. Increased urbanization and industrialization make us more vulnerable to the vicissitudes of weather. Weather services throughout the world, accordingly, must be improved and strengthened, not only with funds and manpower, but with knowledge and data. The world weather program addresses itself to these important needs.

Before describing the world weather program, I would like to make a comment about the timeliness of this effort. The need for improved weather services and for a better understanding of the weather has been apparent for many years. In recent times, however, advances in science and technology have

provided tools which contain the promise of real breakthroughs in our understanding of the weather.

I am referring to satellites, modern communications techniques, and large, high-speed computers, among other developments. With these tools, scientists now see the way to development of a capability for long-range weather predictions. On the basis of studies, they believe it may be possible to make weather predictions for periods up to 2 weeks, if we really exert the required effort.

This goal cannot be achieved by one nation on its own, relying solely on its own resources. Weather is a global phenomenon. It knows no national boundaries. It does not recognize competing ideologies or different ways of life. Each nation needs observations of the weather from outside its own borders. This is particularly true in the case of the United States. We are a vast land area surrounded on two sides by large oceans. Weather affecting the United States may have its origin over these masses of water, or over foreign countries. Yet many areas are not adequately observed. In fact, about 80 percent of the earth is inadequately observed at the present time. As a nation, we have as much, and possibly more to gain than most other countries from a world weather program. At the same time, success of the program requires the cooperation of many countries.

The world weather program contains two major elements:

One is the world weather watch, a global system for observing, communicating, and processing weather data. The second is a global research effort—the global atmospheric research program—to obtain better understanding of the physics of the atmosphere. Together, these twin elements represent one of the largest scientific endeavors ever undertaken on an international basis. It is designed to yield immediate gains as well as long-range objectives. The program has the enthusiastic support of the World Meteorological Organization—a specialized agency of the United Nations—and the International Council of Scientific Unions.

In addition to improving our weather prediction capability, the world weather program will make a substantial contribution to the weather modification activities proposed in S. 373 which I introduced earlier this year. The world weather program will provide the global data and understanding of the atmosphere which is required for the achieving of climate modification. With a breakthrough in this area unimaginable changes in the way of life for all the people on the earth could come within the grasp of mankind. Theoretically, these could range from turning barren lands into fertile, productive areas, all the way to elimination of the threat of weather hazards around the globe.

The United States is currently carrying on activities under the world weather program. These activities are fully justified by virtue of their contribution to our national needs and objectives. Endorsement of the world weather program through the joint resolution would place the unequivocal voice of the Congress

squarely behind this bold and imaginative plan to use the knowledge of mankind for the benefit of mankind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 116) to provide for an expanded and intensified effort to increase the accuracy and extend the time range of weather predictions and to request the President to take action so that the peoples of the United States derive, at the earliest possible time, the social and economic benefits that would accrue from achievement of this new level of capability in weather predictions, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 400 AND 401

Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. HART and Mr. KENNEDY of New York) submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendments when submitted by Mr. HARRIS, which appear under a separate heading.)

TEACHER AIDE AMENDMENT TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 402

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I submit on behalf of myself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. PELL, Mr. MONDALE, and Mr. MUSKIE, a revised draft of my teacher aide amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967.

Under the new language a new part B to title III would be created, to enable local school districts throughout the Nation to train and hire teacher aides to relieve the Nation's classroom teachers of burdensome, noninstructional duties.

This amendment in its previous form would have created a new title to the elementary and Secondary Education Act, but I believe, inasmuch as title III is designed to encourage supplementary services, it is the logical place for inclusion of this amendment.

The new language also amends the Senate bill to include House passed language concerning teacher aides in titles I and V, sponsored by Congressmen STEIGER of Wisconsin, and SCHEUER, of New York.

Under the vigorous and effective leadership of Senator MORSE the Senate Education Subcommittee is now marking up the 1967 Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments. I believe that acceptance of this amendment

would be an important step in improving the educational systems of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Besides performing general noninstructional tasks such as supervising recreation and lunchroom activities, the aides could assist with mechanical tasks in libraries and perform clerical work in school offices.

Persons especially qualified to work under the supervision of a teacher can help with classroom activities.

The need for this amendment is clear and I am confident that it will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 402) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2127) to provide assistance to first processors of cotton who have suffered substantial losses because of the economic impact of cotton programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 12, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 985) for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CLAUDE F. CLAYTON, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, FIFTH CIRCUIT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, October 23, 1967, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit, a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, chairman.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for not to exceed 10 minutes. Although I realize that this is the period for the transaction of routine morning business, I make this request because I have a luncheon engagement at Blair House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE GROWTH OF PRIVATE NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, several of my colleagues in this and the other body have called to my attention telegrams they have received recently from officials of various local affiliates of the United Mine Workers union. The form telegrams refer to recent statements by UMW President W. A. Boyle concerning the alleged dangers to the public health and safety of the "poisonous"—as he characterizes them—nuclear reactors being built today by the civilian electric utility industry. The telegrams also ask that the Atomic Energy Commission's budget be reduced by \$1 billion in order to halt the construction of these reactors.

I have read the Labor Day speech by Mr. Boyle which apparently precipitated these telegrams and which apparently was another salvo in the UMW's campaign to undercut the nuclear power industry. Let me say at the outset that I am not going to engage in a namecalling contest with Mr. Boyle over the relative merits and demerits of coal versus nuclear power. I have no ax to grind with Mr. Boyle. I realize that he has an economic interest to protect here, although I must say in passing that the use of statements calculated to inflame and alarm the public in order to denigrate a supposed competitor is going a bit beyond the bounds of propriety. But I shall try to keep this on a higher plane by simply stating the facts. I think they speak for themselves.

First, as to the implication of Government subsidy—I can dispose of that charge with one telling statement. The simple fact of the matter is that not one of the large number of light water reactors ordered by the Nation's utilities since late 1963 has been funded with Federal money. Beginning with the Oyster Creek and Nine Mile Point reactors in the later months of 1963, and continuing through the first 9 months of 1967, 54 such reactors, representing 41,992 net electrical megawatts, have been ordered—all without Government financial participation. These reactors were sold on a strict commercial basis—an arm's-length private transaction between the reactor manufacturers and the purchasing utilities who deem these reactors worthwhile investments from the standpoint of economics and from the standpoint of the health and safety of their customers.

I frankly do not know, and I do not believe anyone else knows, whether actual operating experience with these reactors will verify the economic estimates on which their purchase was based. We do know that the smaller reactors from which the new generations of reactors were extrapolated worked pretty much as anticipated—reliably, safely, and approximately at the cost levels predicted for them. But until we have acquired a reasonable period of operating experience with the first of the new and larger reactors just coming into service, we will not have definite assur-

ance that they will operate more economically, or even as economically, as electrical generating plants fueled by conventional energy sources.

Nor is there any subsidy involved in the nuclear power industry's obtaining enriched uranium produced in the Government's gaseous diffusion plants. Only recently, the Joint Committee asked the General Accounting Office to review this situation in connection with the Commission's recently announced \$26 charge, and tails assay, for the uranium enrichment services which will be instituted on January 1, 1969. Specifically, the Comptroller General was asked this question by the Joint Committee:

Does this charge and tails assay provide any subsidy to the foreign or domestic nuclear industry, or any portion thereof?

The Comptroller General's answer was explicitly negative. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Assistant Comptroller General's letter of September 25, 1967, bearing on this matter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PASTORE. In the near future there will be one exception to the long list of waterpower reactors sold without Government participation—an exception specifically authorized by Congress because of the experimental nature of the project concerned. I refer, of course, to the proposed Metropolitan Water District nuclear power-desalting project, a developmental undertaking intended to provide important new information concerning the use of large dual-purpose nuclear reactors. It will be recalled that Congress earlier this year and in 1966 authorized the participation of the Interior Department and the AEC in that project, which is being financed in major part by electric utilities and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. In this connection, it should be clearly recognized that the AEC's financial contribution to the project will not provide assistance to the development, design, construction, operation or maintenance of the nuclear powerplants themselves. Rather, the AEC will assist in several aspects of this project pertaining to the interrelationship of nuclear power and desalting.

The only other new experimental power reactor project in which the AEC is participating involves a new and completely different type of reactor—the high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor that is scheduled to be built at Fort St. Vrain, Colo., by the General Dynamics Corp. and the Public Service Co. of Colorado with AEC financial assistance.

Finally, I should make passing mention of the Price-Anderson nuclear indemnity legislation, which has also been cited from time to time as a "subsidy" for the nuclear power industry. As many Senators will recall, that act was passed by Congress in 1957 to overcome the roadblock to the development of nuclear power presented by the uninsurable potential liabilities arising from use of the atom to generate electricity. Its twofold

purpose—namely, protecting the public and the AEC's licensees and contractors from the financial risks associated with atomic energy—is achieved by providing for a combined program of private insurance and governmental indemnity amounting to a maximum of \$560 million to cover damages that could conceivably arise from a nuclear disaster.

Basically, the act works like this: It requires certain licensees to furnish financial protection—in the form of private insurance or as otherwise provided in the act—in amounts specified by the Commission to cover public liability claims; it requires the Commission to provide indemnity protection in amounts up to \$500 million for each nuclear incident; and it limits the liability of all persons liable to the aggregate of the financial protection required and the Commission's indemnity.

In the case of all but the smallest power reactors in operation today, the act specifically requires that the operator thereof furnish the maximum amount of financial protection available from private sources—currently \$74 million. The effect of the latter requirement is that an operator of one of the medium size reactors—such as the 462-megawatt—electrical—Connecticut Yankee reactor just coming into service—will have to pay an annual premium in the neighborhood of \$280,000 for private insurance protection. The same operator will have to pay an annual fee to the AEC of approximately \$44,000 for Price-Anderson indemnity coverage. Obviously, the operators of the 1,000-megawatt—electrical—reactors being sold today will have to pay much higher premiums and fees for their insurance and indemnity protection when these reactors come into service.

The Price-Anderson protection scheme has now been in operation for 10 years. One might ask, How much money has the Government had to spend on this "subsidy" to the nuclear power industry? My answer is that not a dollar—nay, not even a red penny—of Government funds has ever been expended under the act to indemnify an AEC licensee. Meanwhile, the Commission, through June 30, 1967, has collected more than a half million dollars in indemnity fees from operators of nuclear facilities. The annual income to the AEC from these fees is expected to swell to nearly \$5 million by 1973.

One other aspect of the Price-Anderson Act deserves special mention. Under an amendment to the act passed last year by Congress on the recommendation of the Joint Committee, an operator of a nuclear reactor, in the event of a substantial nuclear accident at his facility, would not be able to rely on the traditional legal defense that in the absence of negligence, there is no liability. A person injured as a result of such an accident, therefore, would not have to prove that the operator's negligence gave rise to accident, but only that he had suffered damages and that those damages were caused by the nuclear accident. As a result of this amendment to the Price-Anderson Act operators of nuclear reactors, in the unlikely event of a substantial nuclear accident, would be

subject to much more stringent standards of liability than are generally applicable to the public at large. In effect, the operator would be subject to absolute liability.

What, then, would be the effect of cutting the AEC's approximately \$2.5 billion budget by \$1 billion as suggested by representatives of the UMW? The greatest impact would probably be on our national defense effort, to which nearly one-half of the AEC's budget is devoted. Does the UMW want us to cut back in our weapons or naval reactors programs?

Perhaps, instead, Mr. Boyle would have us apply the cut to the Nation's physical research program. That would eliminate, among other things, the controlled thermonuclear research program which we hope one day will lead us to the capability of producing unlimited amounts of electric power through the fusion of hydrogen atoms in sea water.

An additional item that might be cut is the AEC's reactor development program, which is primarily devoted to supporting the Nation's R. & D. effort to develop the fast breeder reactor, a reactor which, once developed, will produce more fuel than it consumes while generating economical electricity. While doing this might eliminate possible future threats to the industry which Mr. Boyle is interested in protecting from competition, none of these actions would eliminate the nonexistent subsidies to the nuclear power industry which Mr. Boyle says he is interested in terminating.

As to the safety of nuclear powerplants, let me say that each and every power reactor that is built in this country must first undergo rigorous safety examination by the Atomic Energy Commission's able regulatory staff, the statutorily independent Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board of the AEC, and by the Commission itself. As a result of the efforts of the manufacturers and the utility industry to bring to their customers economical, reliable, and safe electric power, and of the reviews I have mentioned, there has never been an accident involving a civilian nuclear powerplant which caused injury or damage to a member of the general public. I wish that other industries could point to a safety record as outstanding as that compiled by the nuclear power industry.

In this connection I might add that, with respect to another aspect of nuclear power discussed by Mr. Boyle in equally inflammatory terms—namely, the problem of disposing of radioactive waste material—a recent study by the National Academy of Sciences stated:

Radioactive wastes are a potential source of ground pollution. However, they are not thought to constitute a problem requiring new abatement studies at the present time. The quantity of wastes is small and the quality of disposal is high. A variety of special techniques is used to confine the wastes and keep them out of circulating ground water for geologic periods of time. Wastes from nuclear power generation are certain to increase in future years, but disposal of these, using existing techniques, does not appear to present a serious problem. (National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council publication 1400, "Waste Management and Control" (1966), p. 199)

Two other comprehensive studies prepared in the recent years by non-AEC groups—one, the reports to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Task Force on Environmental Health and Related Problems in June 1967, entitled "A Strategy for a Livable Environment," and the other, the report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee in 1965, entitled "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment"—reference the need for adequate safeguards to protect against any hazards arising out of nuclear power and nuclear radiations. But these are no more than proper acknowledgment that care must be exercised to assure that unwanted effects in the environment are prevented. Significantly, none of the recommendations of the Environmental Pollution Panel relates to radiation, and the only priority goal established by the Task Force on Environmental Health which bears on radiation is principally concerned with the need for refining standards governing the public's exposure to dental and medical X-rays.

Mr. President, far be it for me to minimize potential hazards associated with the use of nuclear energy. I have been a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy too long not to realize full well the hazardous nature of the materials and facilities with which we are dealing, as well as the great benefits we may derive from their use. At the same time, however, we know that the atom can be controlled and surrounded with sufficient protective safeguards to permit it to take its place alongside the Nation's conventional energy sources. The safety record of the nuclear industry is graphic evidence of that fact.

Caution has been the byword of the program. The Atomic Energy Commission has done a magnificent job in seeing to it that safety has been an abiding consideration in all that has been done to bring the benefits of the peaceful atom to our people. The Joint Committee, meanwhile, has maintained a close watch over the AEC's and the industry's shoulders to insure that the overriding consideration of safety has remained uppermost in the minds of all who have entered the atomic industry. Our hundreds of hours of public hearings on this matter over a period of many years should demonstrate our vigilance of these problems to any objective observer.

Between now and the year 2000, Mr. President, this Nation is going to have to build the equivalent of seven additional power systems of the size that is now serving the American people. To meet this tremendous surge we will have need for increasing amounts of all forms of fuels—coal, oil, gas, hydro, and nuclear. The suppliers of fossil fuels will be hard pressed to meet the ever-increasing demands that will be placed upon them. In fact, I would like to quote from the October 5 issue of the National Coal Policy Conference newsletter on this subject:

New electric generating plants built or already announced for the last half of this decade will require almost 200 million additional tons of coal a year, compared to the 260 million tons already being consumed in

existing plants, a new National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., study reveals.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the full text of this article, which reflects the continued growth of coal production together with use of nuclear power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as in other industries, fair competition between the various energy forms will be a healthy and invigorating spur to increased productivity. But the various energy forms must remember that they must also be partners. It is, therefore, my hope that we will see no more resort to the kind of competition that I have spoken of today. The task that confronts us is too monumental to leave room for competition by terror tactics, propaganda or innuendo.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news release on this subject which I issued in the latter part of last week to be released yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

[B-159687]

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., September 25, 1967.

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE,

Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The General Accounting Office has made a review of the bases used to establish the amount to be charged by the Atomic Energy Commission for uranium enrichment services. Our review was made in accordance with a request dated September 19, 1967, from the Executive Director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States, and in extension of our examination of the Commission's proposed criteria and contracts for uranium enrichment services, which was made pursuant to the requests contained in letters dated July 5 and 14, 1966, from the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

In the letter of September 19, 1967, we were requested to review the Commission's intended unit charge and tails assay and to provide the Committee with our views on the following questions:

"(1) Is this charge and tails assay consistent with the terms of the AEC's uranium enriching services criteria published in the Federal Register on December 23, 1966?

"(2) Does this charge and tails assay provide any subsidy to the foreign or domestic nuclear industry, or any portion thereof?"

The "Private Ownership of Special Nuclear Materials Act" (Public Law 88-489) requires, among other things, that charges for uranium enrichment services provide reasonable compensation to the Government. In its "Uranium Enrichment Services Criteria," approved effective December 23, 1966, the Commission established a ceiling charge of \$30 per kilogram unit of separative work, subject to upward escalation for the cost of electric power and labor, on the basis that this charge would ensure the recovery of appropriate Government costs projected over a reasonable period of time.

The criteria stated that the cost of separative work would include electric power and all other costs, direct and indirect, of operating the gaseous diffusion plants; appro-

prate depreciation of these plants; and a factor to cover applicable costs of process development, Commission administration and other Government support functions, and imputed interest on investment in plant and working capital.

The ceiling charge of \$30 per unit of separative work was established to provide long-term assurance to the domestic and foreign nuclear industries that enriching services would be available from the Government within a specified ceiling. At the time the criteria were established, the Commission stated that it would in the future announce an actual charge for providing enrichment services within the ceiling charge. On September 21, 1967, the Commission announced that this actual charge should be \$26 per unit of separative work. The Commission advised us that a standard table of enriching services would be established by notice in the Federal Register effective January 1, 1968, which would incorporate the charge of \$26 and a standard tails material assay of 0.2 percent.

The charge and tails material assay selected by the Commission were based on the results of numerous studies which projected operations at various levels of production into future periods. These studies were made using a set of basic assumptions, and analyses were made to determine the effect that changes and refinements in the assumptions would have on the cost of operating the diffusion plants.

As stated in our report on the Commission's proposed criteria and contracts for uranium enrichment services (B-159687, August 1, 1966), the fundamental element which will determine the reliability of the Commission's projections is the accuracy of its assumptions as to future requirements for uranium enrichment services. We have no reason to believe that the Commission's assumptions are unrealistic; also, we recognize that in its studies the Commission has, to the extent practicable, given effect to contingencies and uncertainties.

We believe that, on the basis of our selective review of the Commission's studies in which we accepted the Commission's projections as being reasonably realistic, the charge of \$26 per unit of separative work based on the 0.2 percent tails assay is adequate to permit recovery of appropriate Government costs projected over a number of years and is consistent with the Commission's criteria published in the Federal Register on December 23, 1966. Further, considering that the charge also provides a margin for contingencies, we do not see a basis for asserting that a subsidy is being provided to the domestic or foreign nuclear industries, or any portion thereof.

Pursuant to the provisions of the criteria, the Commission has reserved the right to revise the actual charge, within the guaranteed ceiling charge, upon 6 months' prior notice. The Commission has stated that it intends to periodically update its projections and operational planning and will consider such changes as may be indicated by actual production and marketing experience. Therefore, should a material change develop in future years, which would have a consequential effect on the reasonableness of the then applicable charge, we believe that the Commission should make any necessary adjustments to its charge within the established ceiling charge to give effect to changing circumstances.

We have discussed the matters presented in this report with appropriate Commission officials and have considered their views in the final preparation of the report. As agreed by your representatives, we are making copies of this report available to the Commission.

We plan to make no further distribution of this report unless copies are specifically requested, and then distribution will be made only after your approval has been obtained

or public announcement has been made by you concerning the contents of the report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Assistant Comptroller General of the
United States.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., Newsletter, Oct. 5, 1967]

NEW ELECTRIC GENERATING CAPACITY WILL BURN 181 MILLION TONS OF COAL ANNUALLY—57 PERCENT MORE THAN NEW NUCLEAR CAPACITY

New electric generating plants built or already announced for the last half of this decade will require almost 200 million additional tons of coal a year, compared to the 260 million tons already being consumed in existing plants, a new National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., study reveals.

These 116 plants will have a capacity of 72,260 megawatts and, at an average consumption of 2.5 tons of coal per kilowatt of installed capacity, will require 181 million tons of coal annually, or approximately 4 billion tons during their production lifetime.

By comparison, a study of announcements of planned atomic plants shows that about 46,000 megawatts of new nuclear generating capacity is under construction or has been announced. Present generating capacity of nuclear plants is a little less than 2,000 megawatts.

In February of 1966, the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., published *Power for People*, a study of new coal plants going on the line or announced for construction from 1965 forward. These 75 new coal plants had a total capacity of 42,000 megawatts, and would require 105 million tons of coal per year. Between March, 1966, and September, 1967, 41 new plants with 30,266 megawatts of capacity and requiring 76 million tons of coal annually have been announced.

When all these new plants are in operation in about 1971 or 1972, even allowing for the shutdown or phasing out of some of the older plants now operating, total coal required for electric generation in the U.S. is expected to be well over 400 million tons per year.

The Federal Power Commission's widely quoted National Power Survey of 1964 predicted that total demand for electric power would more than triple between 1960 and 1980. It predicted that coal's share of generating capacity would require some 500 million tons annually by 1980, and current growth in coal-fired plants now suggests that even that figure may be conservative.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Office of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Oct. 15, 1967]

CONGRESSIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN COMMENTS ON ALLEGED ATOMIC POWER SUBSIDIES

Attached is the text of remarks which Senator John O. Pastore, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, intends to deliver on the floor of the U.S. Senate on Monday, October 16, concerning the implication, contained in telegrams which a number of Congressmen and Senators have received from local affiliates of the United Mine Workers union, that a large portion of the Atomic Energy Commission's budget is being devoted to subsidization of the nuclear power industry.

In his prepared statement Senator Pastore states that "not one of the large number of light water reactors ordered by the nation's utilities since late 1963 has been funded with Federal money." During that time span, he points out, "54 such reactors representing 41,992 net electric megawatts have been ordered—all without Government financial participation."

With respect to other alleged subsidies to the nuclear power industry, Senator Pastore states that there has never been an expenditure of Government funds under the Price-Anderson nuclear indemnity legislation for a power reactor accident in the 10 years of that Act's existence. "Nor," the Chairman added, "is there any subsidy involved in the nuclear power industry's obtaining enriched uranium produced in the Government's gaseous diffusion plants." In this connection Senator Pastore plans to insert in the Congressional Record a letter received recently from the Assistant Comptroller General stating that "we do not see a basis for asserting that a subsidy is being provided to the domestic or foreign nuclear industries, or any portion thereof" by the Commission's recently announced charges for uranium enrichment services.

As to the safety of nuclear powerplants, which representatives of the U.M.W. refer to as "poisonous," the Chairman notes that there has never been an accident involving a nuclear powerplant which caused injury or damage to a member of the general public. He attributes this outstanding safety record to the efforts of the reactor manufacturers and the utility industry, and to the rigorous safety examination of all such plants by the Atomic Energy Commission and certain AEC-related groups participating in the Commission's regulatory program.

Senator Pastore concludes by saying that the task that confronts the nation and the various fuel producers—building, by the year 2000, the equivalent of seven additional power systems of the size now serving the American people—"is too monumental to leave room for competition by terror tactics, propaganda or innuendo."

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MCCARTHY

MR. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have been asked to request unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] be recognized for one-half hour after the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. PASTORE. I make this request on behalf of my dear friend, the acting majority whip, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

VIETNAM—REPUBLICAN PARTY PLACES COUNTRY ABOVE PARTY

MR. MILLER. Mr. President, the lead editorial in yesterday's Washington Sunday Star, entitled "Vietnam and the Republican Strategy," states that:

The debate thus far has been drawn solely along the lines of personal conviction.

Apparently the writer of the editorial did not see the Associated Press story of October 9, which appeared in several Iowa newspapers. This story quotes the Democratic Senator from Massachusetts as having said, at a Democratic fund-raising dinner in Des Moines a week ago Saturday:

If the Republicans had been running the war, our soldiers would be fighting today in North Vietnam, fighting Chinese soldiers, laying down their lives without hope of victory.

While obviously this represents a personal conviction which completely ignores the record of the Eisenhower administration, it is partisan politics at its worst. It demeans the intelligence of

the people of my State, most of whom are far too perceptive and remember history far too well, including the humiliating and costly Bay of Pigs disaster, to be fooled by such a statement.

The people of Iowa are warm and hospitable, and they remember with a great amount of affection the late President John F. Kennedy. It ill behooves anyone to take advantage of their hospitality by insulting their intelligence and good judgment. Statements such as the one I have quoted are all too reminiscent of the 1964 Democratic presidential campaign which was calculated to frighten the voters into the erroneous belief that the war would grow bigger and worse if the Republican Party were to succeed. The deception of this campaign has long since been exposed to public view, and members of the Republican Party who witnessed the tragic results such deception wrought to our two-party system have had to swallow very, very hard, with a few minor exceptions, to lend bipartisan support to the war effort as it grew bigger and worse under a Democratic President.

An objective reading of history would, if anything, cause one to think that if the policies of the Eisenhower administration had been carried forward, as they could have been with different results in the elections of 1960 and 1964, there would have been no war in Vietnam at all, and there would never have been a Cuban missile crisis, much less a Bay of Pigs disaster. And had it not been for the election of a Republican President in 1952, we could still be fighting a prolonged war in Korea.

Wars are not born of resolute U.S. leadership, Mr. President. And resolute leadership is needed to shorten wars resulting from miscalculation which ir-resolute leadership encourages.

Let it be understood that the Republican Party places the well-being of our country above party, but if any Democratic politician seeks to throw stones, his glass house will be promptly demolished.

I ask unanimous consent that the Associated Press article appearing in the October 9 issue of the Cedar Rapids Gazette and the Washington Sunday Star editorial be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ottumwa Courier, Oct. 9, 1967]

TED KENNEDY AT IOWA DINNER

DES MOINES.—If a Republican had been president for the past seven years, Sen. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., said, American servicemen would be fighting Chinese communists in North Vietnam.

And, predicted the senator in a speech prepared for a Democratic fund-raising dinner Saturday night, the American people will give President Johnson "a vote of confidence and gratitude" in next year's election.

"The American people don't want brain-wash. They don't want eyewash. They don't want Hollywood mascara. They want a party that cares, and a man who can produce," declared Kennedy.

He said the GOP is committed to "the reckless and dangerous course of all-out bombing, even of the ships of neutral nations."

"If the Republicans had been running the war, our soldiers would be fighting today in North Vietnam, fighting Chinese soldiers, laying down their lives without hope of victory."

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 15, 1967]

VIETNAM AND THE REPUBLICAN STRATEGY

There is nothing surprisingly, distressing or improper about the fact that a major national debate is taking place over the administration's conduct of the Vietnam war.

There's nothing new, either, in the notion that the political leaders of the nation are answerable to the people and their elected representatives in time of war. The present debate, which has mounted in fury in direct proportion to United States involvement in the war, has its historical precedent in the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War and the Korean war. Only the two World Wars, with their total involvement of national effort, produced virtually total acquiescence.

The debate thus far has been drawn solely along the lines of personal conviction. In Congress, party politics have been conspicuously absent. The administration's chief defender in the Senate is the leader of the opposition party, Senator Dirksen. The loudest and most persistent critic is the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright. And the administration's official defense, now being presented with refreshing aggressiveness by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, also has been kept free from the petty confines of partisan politics.

But while it is the unquestioned right, if not the obligation, of every individual to search his mind and own conscience in order to determine what stand he should take on this nation's involvement in South Vietnam, it is not the duty nor the right of any political party to do so. Yet there have been increasing signs in recent weeks that the Republican party, as it moves toward the presidential election of 1968, is being tempted to make opposition to the administration's conduct of the war a matter of party policy and a major issue in the political debate to come.

Some of the leading Republican candidates, seeking out areas of vulnerability in the administration and in their opponents within the party, have abandoned previous positions to take up anti-war positions. Senator Percy calls for a greater emphasis on negotiations and a less reliance on military achievement. Governor Romney proclaims that his earlier pro-administration stand was in error; that he was, in fact, brainwashed by the administration. Senator Morton, the former GOP national chairman, in an effort to protect Romney's image from a fearful beating, makes the remarkable assertion that President Johnson was himself brainwashed into submission by his generals and admirals. There are published reports that Rockefeller and Nixon are moving toward an anti-administration stand. There are rumors that Reagan may, before convention time, join them there. Unattributed intelligence from the inner councils of the Republican party report a move to bounce Senator Dirksen as head of the platform committee because of his unswerving support of administration policy.

The temptation for the Republican party to make political hay out of Vietnam is undoubtedly strong. But any such move would be divisive, dishonest and highly dangerous.

It has often been pointed out that any show of dissent from official policy by any prominent individual is damaging, to some extent, to the quest for peace in Southeast Asia. And it is quite true that such displays of indecision and confusion of purpose must inevitably encourage Hanoi in the hope that, if they can only hang on long enough, American determination will crumble and American troops will be withdrawn.

There is, however, an enormous difference between individual expressions of doubt and concern, and the adoption of an official, anti-war stand by a major political party. It is

quite safe to assume that Ho Chi Minh is politically sophisticated enough to understand the difference between the convoluted soul-searching of a William Fulbright and the fixed, calculated, positive assertion of a party platform plank.

What would be the effect on the leadership in Hanoi and in the National Liberation Front if an official anti-war stand were adopted by the Republican party?

The moment that Ho and his lieutenants become convinced that the administration's opposition in next year's election is dedicated to a peace at any price policy in Vietnam, they cannot logically do anything other than to wait for the outcome of the election and hope for best.

If, on the other hand, Hanoi knows that the opposition candidate is dedicated to seeing the United States commitment through—or even if the attitude of the opposition party is uncertain—then the situation is reversed. Then, there would be considerable pressure on Ho to negotiate within the next 18 months, while the President still faces the election. It could be another four years before Johnson or his successor in office is again so strongly motivated to accept a compromise.

A decision by the Republican party to strike at the opposition's Vietnam policy will insure the continuation of the war for another year at least. It will divide the nation further in an area where dangerous division already exists. It will, in fact, be a cruel deception.

No Republican candidate, regardless of his campaign statements or the platform on which he runs, will in our opinion, actually be able to bring the Vietnam war to a quick end if he is elected. It is all very well to talk about negotiations; to negotiate is something else again. The unfortunate fact of the matter is that neither Hanoi nor the Viet Cong have, to this moment, shown any interest whatsoever in negotiating an end to the conflict, despite constant official and unofficial, public and private offers by the administration to stop shooting and start talking.

That leaves only one sure, quick way out of Vietnam for any future administration: Simply to pack up and leave. It is inconceivable that any President, faced with the realities of responsibility, would finally decide that it is in the national interest to scrap our treaty obligations and destroy our international credibility in one easy step. The President in 1969—regardless of what his name or party may be—most assuredly will be holding out for negotiations and an honorable peace before United States troops are withdrawn from Vietnam.

The Republican party must resist the temptation to play upon the nation's unformulated worries and dissatisfactions in the hope of a victory at the polls. There are, after all, legitimate and honest issues on which Lyndon Johnson can be attacked, and possibly defeated.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BAKER

Mr. BAKER and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for approximately 20 minutes in connection with the presentation of a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-

ator from Tennessee has requested that he may proceed for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAKER. I would be happy to yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I desire to speak in the morning hour, and I would expect to ask for 3 or 4 additional minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have no objection, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has indicated he will yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BAKER. I would be more than happy to yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

WE SHOULD DEESCALATE INSTEAD OF EXPANDING OUR WAR IN VIETNAM—WE SHOULD STOP BOMBING NORTH VIETNAM OR RESPOND TO U.N. APPEAL TO DO SO

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is shocking to Americans that in recent months more and more American soldiers and marines are being killed in combat in the ugly civil war in Vietnam than Vietnamese serving in the South Vietnamese friendly forces, so called. Indeed, the friendly forces have become much too friendly.

It was recently reported in Newsweek that at Dak To, in the central highlands of Vietnam, an entire South Vietnamese regiment took itself out of action in order to concentrate upon supplying the 173d U.S. Airborne Brigade base with beer, prostitutes, and laundry service. Similarly, it was reported that another Vietnamese unit performs the same function for the 4th U.S. Division near Pleiku; and that adjoining our airfield at Bien Hoa, a hustling South Vietnamese ranger unit has built a redlight district known as Tijuana East to the GI's serving there.

This is additional evidence of the distressing fact that a very large percentage of the men serving in the South Vietnamese Army have simply stopped fighting. The South Vietnamese army is riddled with factionalism, nepotism, corruption, inefficiency, incompetence and cowardice. It is too often either unwilling or unable to perform even the limited and relatively easy task which is now practically its only mission—the protection of rural pacification teams, so called.

During the past 3 months, American combat deaths have far exceeded those of the ARVN, or South Vietnamese forces. In fact, it is startling that the total number of our casualties now regularly exceeds the number of young men conscripted into the South Vietnamese Army each month. The truth is that South Vietnam has no conscription worthy of the name. Draft dodging is rampant. In the month of August alone more American boys were drafted into our Armed Forces than the South Vietnamese had conscripted during the previous 6 months. This is a shocking situation. It is unconscionable that American boys should be called upon to fight and die in a little country 10,000 miles from our shores when the citizens of that country are unwilling to defend them-

selves and have failed to maintain a viable government.

The desertion rate in the South Vietnamese Army is staggering. There were more than 113,000 desertions last year alone. At the present rate, desertions this year will exceed 75,000. This is an annual desertion rate of 12 percent. In 1966 the desertion rate exceeded 20 percent.

The South Vietnamese Army is riddled with corruption and inefficiency. For example, it was recently discovered that one division commander sold rice to the Vietcong that had been provided by our AID program. Other officers are actively engaged in smuggling and other illegal operations, much of this profiteering on deals with the Vietcong.

After spending billions of taxpayers' dollars during more than a decade to try to create an army in South Vietnam, we now find ourselves saddled with a military white elephant that is practically worthless. The officer corps is lacking in almost all the qualities necessary to build an effective army. It is common practice to sell commissions in the army. All too often, senior Vietnamese officers have succumbed to the temptation to become wealthy by graft and profiteering.

Perhaps most shocking are reports that the Vietcong have infiltrated the South Vietnamese forces like termites in a rotten log. Some American intelligence officers estimate that as many as 30 percent of the officers and men in the South Vietnamese Armed Forces are sympathizers or agents of the Vietcong. For many reasons, not the least of which is the enormous difference in pay received by each, there is a great deal of hostility between American soldiers and Vietnamese soldiers. Some reporters on the scene have the impression that many Vietnamese servicemen regard the main enemy as America and the Vietcong as only a secondary enemy.

Incredibly, South Vietnam's armed forces—all trained, paid, equipped, and advised by the United States—outnumber the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese supporters by at least 5 to 1. Despite this fact, it is generally agreed that the armed forces of the Saigon regime would collapse in a matter of hours if left to fight the war on its own.

The blame for this reprehensible situation cannot be attributed to the claim that Vietnamese do not make good fighters. Those serving in the Vietcong have proven themselves to be formidable opponents. Vietnamese born and reared in the Mekong Delta and elsewhere in South Vietnam fight bravely as VC, or forces of the National Liberation Front. Also, those Vietnamese who fought for the liberation of their country against the Japanese and then the French colonial oppressors proved their worth as fighting men. They were fighting for a cause—the liberation of Vietnam—just as the VC now feel they are doing.

The Saigon forces as well as the Vietcong are made up of Vietnamese soldiers from north, central, and south Vietnam. They speak the same language, eat the same food, and very often even come from the same families. Nevertheless, in almost every instance of direct combat between the two forces, the Vietcong con-

sistently bests the larger South Vietnamese forces. The reason for this, according to claims usually made by Defense Department officials, is that a guerrilla army must be outnumbered by at least 10 to 1. However, the fact remains that in most instances where South Vietnamese forces have come into direct contact with the Vietcong, they have been defeated and have suffered far greater casualties than the VC.

The fact is that the soldiers in the South Vietnamese Army, if it can be called an army, are not really interested in the struggle imposed upon them by their tory leaders in Saigon. If they had any will to fight at all, it would soon be driven from them by their venal and inept commanders.

Let us face it. We are picking up virtually the entire check in Vietnam which now totals more than \$2.5 billion every month and several hundred American lives each week. The fact is that we have paid for the war in Vietnam, and now it belongs to us.

In his San Antonio speech, the President stated that Vietnam is the scene of "powerful aggression that has been spurred by an appetite for conquest." It will take some doing to convince the American people that Ho Chi Minh, the leader of a small underdeveloped agrarian country struggling to emerge from more than a century of colonial oppression, presents the same danger to our vital national interests as Hitler did in his efforts to conquer the world. The truth is all too plain that no great moral crusade is involved in Vietnam. To the contrary, our involvement in that civil war has placed us in a morally indefensible position.

The truth is we are not fighting communism in Vietnam. More important, we are fighting Vietnamese nationalism which developed out of years of colonial exploitation. It is true that Communists have taken over leadership of the nationalist movement in Hanoi.

Of course, communism diluted by nationalism can still create a great deal of mischief. However, the ogre of a monolithic communism bent on world conquest is just no longer credible. The great and bitter schism between Communist China and Soviet Russia shows no sign of healing, although our continued foolish involvement in the Vietnamese civil war may yet succeed in driving these two opponents together again. The former Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe, while still Communist, have gained control of their own internal affairs. They are also beginning to assert independence in foreign policy. Ho Chi Minh, like Tito in Yugoslavia, is a nationalist Communist. Tito's Yugoslavia is not a Soviet satellite, nor is North Vietnam a Chinese satellite.

Secretary of State Rusk claims that by fighting in Vietnam we are, in effect, fighting Chinese communism, which would eventually have to be fought elsewhere if not in Vietnam. The truth is that despite 20 years of agonizing war, the North Vietnamese have amazingly avoided becoming puppets of either Communist China or Soviet Russia. We are not fighting Chinese communism. We are fighting Vietnamese nationalism

which, far from opening the door to Chinese conquest, offers the best hope of erecting political and cultural barriers to such conquest.

The Vietnamese for years have feared the Chinese colossus to their north. Vietnam is studded with monuments commemorating victories of the past over Chinese aggressors. Ho Chi Minh himself was a prisoner in a Chinese dungeon in 1944. While he is a Communist, to term as "Communist" all the Vietcong, many of them ignorant villagers, does not really make them Communists. First and foremost they are Vietnamese patriots fighting for their country's independence, first from the Japanese, then from the French colonial oppressors, and now from the United States, which they consider to have supplanted the French as aggressors in Southeast Asia.

The truth is that we are ravaging a small country which presents no threat to our national security. Our ever expanding bombing of the north seems aimed at destroying the people of an independent nation. Saigon has never been and never will be an outpost for the protection of Seattle or San Francisco.

Mr. President, General Westmoreland has stated that we are fighting a war of attrition in Vietnam. We are very painfully learning that attrition is a double-edged sword. Every escalation of the war mires us more irretrievably in a massive ground war in Asia—a war in which there can be no victory and in which the steady growth of casualties including our killing many, many thousands of Vietnamese women, children, and men reduces the prospect of ever achieving a negotiated peace.

This has already cost the lives of more than 15,000 fine young Americans killed in combat and the wounding of 85,000 more. It has also caused the deaths of more than 150,000 Vietnamese civilian men, women and children. Last April, United States officials in Saigon estimated that 50,000 civilians, including 10,000 children, would be treated for war injuries in south Vietnamese hospitals during the present year. It has been estimated that only a half or a third of the wounded actually reach hospitals, and that the actual number of deaths and injuries are occurring at a rate of more than 100,000 a year. Most of these horrible and terrifying deaths and injuries to civilian men, women and children result from American air strikes and artillery bombardment. This, in addition to the thousands of civilians killed, maimed, and scarred for life by our bombing of North Vietnam. We must bring a halt to this carnage.

Mr. President, I know that there are few Members of the Congress, if any, who believe that we should have become involved in this Vietnam civil war in the first instance. It would be well to recall that the Chinese sage Confucius wrote:

A man who makes a mistake and does not correct it makes another mistake.

We must not compound the tragic errors of the past 6 years. Immediate and meaningful action must be taken toward extricating ourselves from this tragic conflict.

I again urge the President to announce

an unconditional halt to the bombing of North Vietnam in the hope this will bring the North Vietnamese to the conference table within the ensuing 20 or 30 days. All indications are that it will. Our allies and friends and leaders of Communist nations have repeatedly stated that there can be no negotiations until the bombing stops and without conditions attached.

The administration has taken the position that the only alternative to our continued involvement in Vietnam is abject, dishonorable withdrawal. The plain truth is that an honorable alternative exists by halting further escalation of the ground fighting and an unconditional cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam, followed by negotiations for a compromise settlement based on the Geneva agreements.

If the President feels that he cannot retreat from his present position regarding a halt to the bombing he could, without loss of face, make it known that the United States would put aside its own official views on the bombing if the United Nations called for its suspension as a step toward negotiations. In his efforts to settle the Algerian war by negotiation, President De Gaulle at one critical juncture withdrew an entire division of French troops as a means of convincing the Algerians that he genuinely desired a political settlement. Neither France nor De Gaulle lost face. Nor would we, the most powerful nation that ever existed under the bending sky of God, forfeit respect or any meaningful military advantage by similarly taking the step which only we can take to set the peace machinery in motion.

Furthermore, it is now absolutely clear from Secretary McNamara's testimony before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee last August that the bombing does not seriously hamper the flow of military supplies from North Vietnam to the south. Equally important, he expressed doubt that reduction of the bombing would bring a marked increase in American casualties in South Vietnam as claimed by some of the warhawk generals. Nor does Secretary McNamara believe that any bombing short of extermination of North Vietnam's population, which no one should be advocating, would break Hanoi's will or force a surrender. It is clear from Secretary McNamara's testimony that a suspension of the bombing can only advance the prospects for peace.

We must reject the shrill calls for escalation of the ground war and unlimited bombing of the north from the warhawk Chiefs of Staff. President Eisenhower, in what has been termed his farewell address, warned the Nation of the dangers inherent in the growth of a military-industrial complex that has arisen in our Nation since World War II and the advent of the cold war. We must not permit this military-industrial complex, now made bolder by the Vietnam war and the huge defense budgets that go with it—\$70 billion this year alone—to win control over our defense and foreign policies. The militarization of our foreign policy must be halted.

Mr. President, an announcement by President Johnson that we will cease bombing North Vietnam or a positive re-

sponse by us to a United Nations appeal for an end of the bombing would be an act of magnanimity by a powerful nation well able to afford to be magnanimous. It would place the Hanoi government under irresistible pressure to negotiate. It would convince a skeptical world that our Persistence means what he says when he calls for a political solution to the Vietnamese war rather than fighting on to a military victory slaughtering a people and devastating their land.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland for a brief statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE RUSK AT NEWS CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 12, 1967

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, there is uncertainty in America as to what U.S. policy in Southeast Asia should be. Surely many divergent points of view have been expressed in the U.S. Senate.

Last week, Secretary of State Dean Rusk clearly and forcefully reiterated the U.S. policy. Because I believe that the American people appreciate candor and wish to know the truth, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Secretary of State be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK'S NEWS CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 12

I should like to begin with a brief comment on the current public discussion of Vietnam.

I find no significant body of American opinion which would have us withdraw from Vietnam and abandon Southeast Asia to the fate which Asian Communism has planned for it. Similarly, I find no serious opinion among us which wishes to transform this struggle into a general war.

We Americans are, therefore, debating variations on a theme—but the theme is a central position resting upon (A) the need to meet our commitments and defend our vital national interests; (B) the pursuit of our limited objectives by limited means, and (C) our earnest desire to bring this conflict to a peaceful conclusion as soon as possible. Hanoi particularly should not misunderstand the character of this debate.

Our commitment is clear and our national interest is real. The SEATO treaty, approved with only one dissenting vote by our Senate, declares that "each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area . . . would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger." The treaty says "each party" will act.

The fidelity of the United States is not subject to the veto of some other signatory—and five signatories have engaged their forces alongside Korean and South Vietnamese troops. Indeed, the proportion of non-United States forces in South Vietnam is greater than non-United States forces in Korea.

RESOLUTION BY CONGRESS IN 1964 NOTED

In August, 1964, the Congress by joint resolution declared, with only two dissenting

votes, that "the United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia."

This was not a new idea in 1964. It was the basis for the SEATO treaty a decade earlier. It is no less valid in 1967. Our several alliances in the Pacific reflect our profound interest in peace in the Pacific, no less vital to us as a nation than is peace in our own hemisphere or in the NATO area.

I have heard the word "credibility" injected into our domestic debate. Let me say, as solemnly as I can, that those who would place in question the credibility of the pledged word of the United States under our mutual security treaties would subject this nation to mortal danger. If any who would be our adversary should suppose that our treaties are a bluff, or will be abandoned if the going gets tough, the result could be catastrophe for all mankind.

It is not easy for our people to wage a struggle by limited means for limited objectives. We Americans are an impatient people—a quality which has helped to build a great nation. The present impatience about Vietnam is thoroughly understandable—and is shared by those who carry official responsibility. But our overriding object is—and must be—the establishment of a reliable peace.

It is easy to rush into total catastrophe. It requires courage and determination to act with both firmness and restraint in the interest of peace. An examination of all the crises in which we have been involved since 1945 will show, I think, the supremacy of the objective of a reliable peace.

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT QUOTED

President Johnson has emphasized, time and time again, his interest in a prompt and peaceful settlement of the present struggles in Southern Asia. Just two weeks ago, in San Antonio, he said:

"The United States is willing to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussions. We, of course, assume that while discussions proceed, North Vietnam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation."

Can there be a more reasonable proposal? Is there anything unfair about such a simple proposition? Is it not clear that if Hanoi is interested in peace it could say "yes" publicly or privately to the President's offer?

A rejection, or a refusal even to discuss such a formula for peace, requires that we face some sober conclusions. It would mean that Hanoi has not abandoned its effort to seize South Vietnam by force. It would give reality and credibility to captured documents which describe a "fight and negotiate" strategy by Vietcong and the North Vietnamese forces. It would reflect a view in Hanoi that they can gamble upon the character of the American people and of our allies in the Pacific.

Earlier I referred to variations on a theme. The debate in which we are now involved is essentially a debate about detail—this or that military move, this or that diplomatic step—this or that formulation of what is in fact a common middle position. If that be true, precision is important. People at least should make it clear whether they are arguing with Washington or with Hanoi.

HANOI'S VIEWS ARE REPORTED

When people talk about a pause in bombing, they should know that Hanoi calls a pause an "ultimatum." When a Senator says that he wants to stop the bombing but, of course, wishes to continue to bomb in support of our marines south of the DMZ, he should know that Hanoi categorically rejects any such notion. When people say "negotiate now" they should know that the President would meet with Ho Chi Minh and other Chiefs of State concerned, tomorrow—and

that I would depart today for any mutually convenient spot if I could meet a representative of North Vietnam with whom I could discuss peace in Southeast Asia.

Chairman Thieu and Prime Minister Ky have repeatedly offered to meet with the authorities of Hanoi to arrange a cease-fire and a peaceful settlement. They and we both responded affirmatively to U Thant's proposals of last March. Had there been a similar response from Hanoi, there would have been discussions to arrange a military standstill, preliminary conversations and a convening of the Geneva conference. Literally dozens of proposals made by ourselves, other governments or groups of governments have been rejected by Hanoi.

I cannot tell you when peace will come. I am encouraged by progress toward peace in South Vietnam, but I cannot name a date. But we shall continue our effort both by resisting those who would impose their solutions by brute force and by an unrelenting exploration of every path which could lead to peace.

ALLOCATION OF TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time yielded to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] not be charged to the time allotted to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN GUERRILLA INSURGENCY IN BOLIVIA

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it now appears that Bolivian Armed Forces have successfully stemmed a Cuban-led Communist insurgency in that important South American nation.

The death October 8 of Ernesto "Che" Guevara in a clash between the Bolivian Army and the guerrillas has broken the back of the insurgency and provided a dramatic climax to several months of dedicated effort by the Bolivians—an effort that cost that country much in casualties and human life and much in material resources which it so badly needs to pursue its economic development policies.

Mr. President, the Bolivian Government and especially the Bolivian Armed Forces should be enthusiastically congratulated on their victory. Free people throughout this hemisphere owe them an immeasurable debt of gratitude.

Our own Government, our State Department and other concerned agencies, also should be commended for having the wisdom to avoid the temptation to become actively involved in the Bolivian operation. It appears that in this situation our people neither underreacted nor overacted to the impending crisis. It shows that all American nations must be ever vigilant to the threat of communism; they must help without dominating and often the best way to help is by keeping hands off. As it was, the Bolivians have had the exhilarating and maturing

experience of winning their own battle without outside interference. The Bolivians handled the problem masterfully from its outset to the final victory. Their handling was excellent not only in the military aspects but in the political aspects as well.

They kept their allies and the world fully informed of developments and their presentation of their case before the Organization of American States was superb. Because of this, the whole world was fully aware of the nature of the insurgency in Bolivia.

I shudder to think of what would have happened if Che Guevara and his Cuban guerrilla fighters had succeeded in this latest, and by far the boldest, attempt to Cubanize the nations of Latin America.

In our very justified concern about Vietnam and in our effort to prevent communism from engulfing Southeast Asia, I fear that we tend to lose sight of the very real danger of communism here in our own backyard.

Bolivia is the fifth largest nation in Latin America with 424,163 square miles. It is located in the very heart of the continent and shares common borders with Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, and Peru. Its location makes it a prime target for international communism's efforts to dominate this hemisphere.

I would like to review some of the facts that are known about the events in Bolivia in the past few months.

It appears that the guerrilla camp was discovered by accident in the rugged territory of southeastern Bolivia while the guerrillas were still in training and preparing for their eventual move to topple the government of President Rene Barrientos.

At the time of the first clash between the Bolivian Army and the guerrillas on March 23, 1967, the guerrillas numbered about 60 men. Of this number, 20 were known to be Cubans, and at least 12 were Bolivians trained in guerrilla warfare in Cuba.

Of the remainder, some had received instruction in guerrilla techniques and tactics from Cuban trainers infiltrated into Bolivia for that purpose. The rest were relatively untrained individuals recruited from the mines or from the ranks of the unemployed in La Paz.

The Cubans were led by Ernesto "Che" Guevara de la Serna, Fidel Castro's chief lieutenant in his own struggle to take over Cuba and later his minister of industries. Guevara's book on guerrilla warfare is the gospel text for would-be Communist guerrilla activities the world over, and he was considered the guiding spirit and example for all guerrilla fighters.

The other Cubans were, for the most part, officers in the Cuban Army with extensive experience in guerrilla warfare.

There is reliable information that at least four of them were in the Congo with "Che" Guevara in 1965, taking part in a rebellion in the eastern part of that country. Among the Cuban guerrillas, Bolivian officials have positively identified the following:

Juan V. Acuna Nunez, a major in the Cuban Army, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba and former commander of the

Western Army of Cuba. He was known by the name of Joaquin in the guerrilla band.

Gustavo Ricardo Machin Hoed de Beche, a major in the Cuban Army, known in the guerrilla band as Alejandro.

Orlando Pantoja Tamayo, a member of the National Security Service of Cuba who was close to Raul Castro. He was known as Antonio.

Antonio Sanchez Diaz, a major in the Cuban Army and member of the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party. He was known as "Marcos."

It is apparent that the Cubans with Guevara in Bolivia were Cuba's foremost experts in the guerrilla art.

It was this highly trained force that repeatedly clashed with the raw recruits of the Bolivian Army from the end of March through July. In these encounters, the guerrillas, with their superior automatic weapons, communications, discipline, and tactics inflicted severe casualties on the army compared to their own relatively light losses.

A break for the Bolivians came when in a mopping up operation in the Nancahuazu area, the Bolivian Army uncovered a cache of significant guerrilla documents. These included 21 falsified passports used by the Cubans, including Ernesto "Che" Guevara, to enter Bolivia. It was on the basis of these passports that a number of the guerrillas in the band were identified. A fragment of a diary written by the Cuban "Braulio" was also recovered by the Bolivian authorities. This diary revealed that "Braulio" had brought \$26,000 to Bolivia from Cuba, \$25,000 of which was for delivery to "Ramon," the nom de guerre of "Che" Guevara. Additional funds were brought into Bolivia from Cuba by returning Bolivian trainees in guerrilla warfare. The passports, along with photographs of the guerrillas and other documents found in the cache, were presented to the meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States—OAS—on September 22-23, 1967, by the Bolivian Foreign Minister, to support his country's demand for OAS sanctions against Cuba.

On August 31, using improved intelligence and counterinsurgency techniques, the Bolivian Army successfully ambushed the rearguard of the guerrilla band, killing nine and capturing the sole survivor. Three of the victims were Cubans. In the latter part of September the Second Ranger Battalion picked up the trail of the main body of guerrillas led by "Che" Guevara. Meanwhile, Bolivian authorities in La Paz arrested a member of the guerrilla support apparatus named Loyola Guzman Lara, in whose home they found documents showing that the guerrilla support mechanism extended to various Latin American countries.

On September 26, 1967, the Second Rangers caught up with the main body of the guerrillas near Higuera, southwest of Vallegrande and killed three of them, including one Cuban known as "Miguel." On October 8, the Rangers closed in on the guerrilla band again. In this encounter, seven guerrillas were killed including Ernesto "Che" Guevara.

"Che" Guevara in an article he wrote for the Cuban magazine *Tricontinental*

entitled "Create Two, Three, Many Vietnams" published in June 1967, stressed the idea that revolutionary activity must be continental in scope, rather than limited to a single country, and that this would cause the United States to give ever-increasing military aid and troops to insure the stability of governments. He said, that this "is the road to Vietnam." If this was indeed "Che" Guevara's plan, the clash on October 8, 1967, was a serious setback to Cuban-sponsored revolution in other countries of Latin America.

Mr. President, the evidence that I have just outlined—which has been confirmed to my fullest satisfaction—shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that the insurgency in Bolivia was an outright case of armed intervention in a sovereign nation by a foreign power.

It is just as obvious that this was indeed a major effort by the Communists, through their Havana puppet, Fidel Castro, to take over another Latin American country. The significant factor of the Cuban leadership lies not so much in numbers but in the rank and importance of the Cubans involved.

Guevara had dropped from sight more than 2 years previously to move about the world incognito. This was a strategically brilliant maneuver because it permitted a great mystique to arise as the world speculated on his whereabouts.

But the valiant Bolivian troops were not awed by this mystique. They continued their relentless search through the rugged Bolivian jungles until the fabled El Che lay mortally wounded and died an ignominious death, not as a martyr to the Communist cause but muttering the words of his failure.

It is easy to understand also why Castro and his henchmen thought Bolivia would be an easy target. Bolivia has been beset by economic, social, and political woes for a good many years. The strife and problems at the tin mines—source of Bolivia's principal wealth—are well known.

It is apparent that the Cubans thought that the Bolivian tin miners, students, and leftist group would flock to their banner in great numbers. But they did not.

To the contrary, we are told that one of the biggest problems Mr. Guevara had was the lack of interest and enthusiasm on the part of his Bolivian recruits. Those few who did join him were soon disenchanted with the guerrilla band. Many defected and went to their homes. We do not know how many actually left, but judging from statements from captured guerrillas, Bolivians and Cubans alike, many did leave.

The events in Bolivia in these past months are deeply significant for the United States.

First, they show that Fidel Castro has adopted a new wrinkle in his attempts to spread communism through the South American mainland.

They indicate that Castro has decided that the only way he can successfully export his revolution to other Latin American countries is by actually providing Cuban leadership for these movements. The Bolivian insurgency was

given cohesion, discipline, and purpose by the presence of Che Guevara, some members of the Cuban Communist Central Committee, and a number of others who fought with Castro and Guevara in the Sierra Maestra. Previously, Castro limited his efforts to training guerrilla leaders and supplying material and financial aid to national guerrilla movements.

This apparently was the first time that Cubans have taken direct control of a national movement by placing their own leadership at its head.

Second, I think the fact that the Bolivians were able to discover, contain, and eventually quash the insurgency without external help will strengthen that country politically. It certainly will have the effect of focusing attention upon Bolivia and underscoring its important position in the hemisphere.

Bolivia has been the recipient of some \$460.6 million in various types of foreign aid between 1946 and 1966. I think there is no doubt that this aid has played an important role in stabilizing Bolivia's shaky economy during some very difficult periods.

Today, Bolivia's economy is showing signs of making a significant recovery. Last year, for the first time in many years, the tin mines showed a profit. But tin is no longer the sole source of the country's wealth. Other areas are looking up as well. Under President Barrientos, Bolivia has been very successful in beginning a diversification of its economy.

Petroleum has become a significant source of income. Great progress has been made in agriculture, particularly in cattle raising.

The gross national product has been increasing at a rate of 5.8 percent in the last few years, and per capita income has increased at a rate of more than 2.5 percent—greater than the minimum set by the Charter of Punta del Este, cornerstone document of the Alliance for Progress.

It seems to me that the \$460.6 million, spread over a period of 20 years has been a small price to pay for the victory in Bolivia. The war in Vietnam costs almost that much in a week.

But it is also important to note that most of that money was spent to shore up the economy of Bolivia under the previous, socialist-oriented government of President Paz Estensoro.

Bolivia's very able ambassador to the United States, Julio Sanjines-Goytia, advises me that Bolivia has received no budgetary support at all since 1964. While continuing the important social revolution started under Paz Estensoro, President Barrientos and General Ovando, head of the armed forces, have established law and order firmly in the country.

President Barrientos has created a good climate for private investment and private initiative in the nation. Bolivia has begun to gradually pay off some of its back debts.

Bolivia has one of the most stable currencies in Latin America.

I understand that the guerrilla insurgency has cost Bolivia approximately \$2.5 million directly and probably double

or triple that indirectly. This seems like a small amount when compared to our costs in Vietnam, but in a country whose total budget is about \$80 million it is very significant indeed.

Ambassador Sanjines advises me that Bolivia is now seeking between \$5 and \$6 million in loans—not grants—to help tide the country over the difficult economic period caused by the insurgency.

I feel that in view of the climate of peace and stability established in Bolivia by its present, democratically elected government, its emphasis on private investment and its position of strategic importance for the long-range goal of Latin American economic integration, we should give immediate and favorable attention to Bolivia's request for aid at this time. Bolivia is not asking for a handout. It is asking for a loan on terms that it can handle. We should heed that request if at all possible.

Third, the insurgency emphasizes that we must not for an instant let down our guard in this hemisphere. While our attention is diverted toward Vietnam on the other side of the world, the Communists are more active and eager than ever to move forward in this hemisphere. The extent of the Cuban involvement and the quality of the Cuban personnel sent to Bolivia vividly demonstrate the determination of Fidel Castro to impose his will upon the millions of free men in this hemisphere.

Castro has failed. Communism has suffered a severe setback. Guevara, the guiding spirit of the Communist revolutionaries around the world, has been killed. He died in ignominious failure. He himself is said to have acknowledged his failure as life slipped from him in the Bolivian jungle.

But it would be a mistake for us to lower our guard in the false security of the Bolivian success. For this will not stop Castro. As long as the Communist dictatorship exists in Cuba, financed at the rate of about \$1 million a day by Soviet Russia, we can expect unending efforts to subvert other nations, to export the Communist doctrine, to set brother against brother, to terrorize, loot, steal, and kill.

Castro has been temporarily thwarted in Bolivia. He has been embarrassed and laid bare not only in the eyes of the free world but in the Communist world as well.

But we can be sure that he will try again and again.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend to the reading of the Senate a fine article about one of the unsung heroes of this body. It appears in the Washington Teamster of October 13, and deals with the many admirable qualities, and outstanding legislative accomplishments, of our good friend and colleague, the dean of the western Senators, the senior Senator from Washington, WARREN MAGNUSON.

As all of us in the Senate know, any tribute to "MAGGIE" is well-deserved. No one works harder while asking less in the way of personal recognition. His rewards are results—the truly lasting monuments

to any legislator's efforts. And MAGGIE has erected a good many monuments in his long public career.

Speaking for the leadership, I cannot praise too highly the graciousness and cooperation of the senior Senator from Washington. Despite the burdens of his responsibilities as chairman of the Commerce Committee, he remains as unassuming as he does dependable. It is a comfort to me to know that this reservoir of strength is there when the going gets tough.

The article describes Senator MAGNUSON as one with "the common touch." Certainly he has cause to be allied with the common man. He was orphaned as a baby and was on his own as a laborer at 17. The philosophy which he acquired in those early days is very much in evidence and is reflected, in part, in the number of consumer-protection bills which issue from his committee. It is this concern for the public interest, along with his zest for hard work, which makes our colleague from Washington a great Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Teamster, Oct. 13, 1967]

WARREN G. MAGNUSON: THE MAN CALLED "MAGGIE"

Crowding the colorful, 30-year congressional career of Sen. Warren Grant Magnuson—the Man Called Maggie—into a 40-paragraph profile would take a Houdini who specializes in boiling down history to its briefest terms.

Perhaps there was none better with a sense for history and humor than the late President John F. Kennedy who came all the way to Seattle to help celebrate Maggie's 25th year in Congress, although Senator Magnuson was committed to the Senate Majority Leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, until the nomination was settled in Los Angeles. In late 1961, President Kennedy told this to the 2,500 guests in five great banquet halls of the Olympic Hotel:

"Most members of the Senate have developed the art of speaking with precision and clarity and force. The secret of Senator Magnuson's meteoric career has been the reverse. He may make clear speeches to you on great public occasions, but in Washington he speaks in the Senate so quietly that few can hear him. He looks down at his desk—he comes into the Senate late in the afternoon—he is very hesitant about interrupting other members of the Senate—when he rises to speak, most members of the Senate have left—he sends his messages up to the Senate and everyone says, 'What is it?' and Senator Magnuson says, 'It's nothing important.' And Grand Coulee Dam is built."

This is an interesting tale not because of one small inaccuracy—Grand Coulee was conceived before Maggie though dedicated during his second term in the House by President Roosevelt—rather because it pinpoints his modus operandi to a tee, and because he is a man of such awesome but unabused power in the Senate that a President of the United States will make it a point to attend a political dinner for a man who had originally backed another horse in the race.

On Senator Magnuson's political acumen, there is no better observer than shrewd John Salter, Sen. Henry M. Jackson's former ad-

ministrative assistant and one of the best grass roots organizers in this territory:

"Maggie may hem and haw when asked a question on some issue for three or four minutes, but I've never seen a politician who can get to the heart of the answer and then be in the position of doing something about it than my friend Senator Magnuson. As a practicing politician I have to mark him down as genius."

Yet, what sets the seventh-ranking senator in the United States above and beyond the run of the mine politicians of our day is his humaneness, sentimentality, and loyalty towards his fellow man. He has what is called the common touch.

On February 14, 1966, the Puget Sound Sportswriters and Sportscasters Association staged their annual Mid-Winter Sports Banquet in the Olympic Hotel. One interlude involved the presentation of a \$1,000 check from Joint Council of Teamsters No. 28 to the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center of the Pacific Northwest Research Foundation. Dr. Bill Hutchinson, Fred's brother, accepted this check, and it was then pointed out by the Speaker that Sen. Warren G. Magnuson was sitting in the audience "just as a sports fan," and that he had promised to go full bore in trying to obtain federal matching funds for the center. The Senator was then asked to stand up and take a bow.

The applause was instantaneous, sustained and thunderous to say the least. Maggie was visibly shaken as he gave the old arms-extended victory sign. After the banquet he told more than one guest who had cheered him on:

"My God, you'd think I had won that award they were giving away up there. I've never heard a hand like that in all my years in politics, and we politicians have pretty sharp antennas for various kinds of hands. I'm never going to forget this evening."

And he hasn't.

Just the other day, The Washington Teamster received a copy of a letter the senator wrote to Baseball Commissioner William Eckert recalling their discussion (in 1964) of a Major League baseball game in Seattle with proceeds going to the Hutchinson Cancer Fund.

"The Hutchinson Cancer Fund is, of course, an entirely nonprofit organization and I can think of no finer effort than for baseball to honor one of its all-time greats while raising some money to ensure that a Hutchinson Cancer Institute will be built in Seattle, an institute which will dedicate its efforts to killing the dread disease which took Fred from us."

It is easy to see that a man as humane, sentimental and loyal couldn't forget his old friend Fred Hutchinson, nor that tumultuous hand the sports fans gave him in Seattle.

Maybe the Hutchinson Cancer Institute isn't as big a plum as Grand Coulee or the SST, but Maggie's persistent private campaign to keep the project alive and in front of responsible people certainly shows the true character of the finest solon this state ever produced.

When a visitor from the Northwest sees the Washington, D.C., Capitol for the first time, he is likely to feel that he is watching history in the making. He lifts his eyes upward and sees statues and monuments dedicated to men he has come to know through books almost as well as he knows men back home. And then he thinks of Senator Magnuson.

This sequence of thoughts hasn't been added out of imagination. It comes from reading the words of two Seattle newspapermen who visited Washington recently and wrote about Senator Magnuson.

"Washington is a city of monuments," one wrote in September 1966. "There'll probably be one around the senate chamber some day

for Hubert Humphrey, and maybe Richard Russell and William Fulbright. But somehow you know it isn't in the cards for Warren Magnuson."

Another had written two months earlier: "He can never be a hero to the mop-hairs. And he knows, too, that a likeness of Maggie never will stand in the historic old Statuary Hall of the Capitol."

Both writers respect the Senator. They laud his many accomplishments in his three decades in the capitol. Their idea that a statue will never be raised in his honor may reflect the feeling that the Northwest came along too late to make important history. Or it may result from the feeling that monuments are not erected for men you know; the man represented in the stone lived in another time, or he lived in your time but in another world—a world of martyrdom.

Senator Magnuson is an unlikely prospect for the martyr's mantle. For one thing, he likes life. And when you stop to think about it, that's a good quality in men who make laws. His dedication to the proposition that all men are entitled to an equal chance at life's good things explains his concern for the legislation that affects the livelihood of fishermen, farmers, merchant seamen, and industrial workers in his home state.

It also goes a ways in explaining why he wrote the measure establishing the National Cancer Institute and led the fight to establish the National Science Foundation. It may help to explain, too, why he has transformed the Commerce Committee he heads into an effective consumer protection legion.

The report that some of Magnuson's colleagues say his concern with consumer problems began when he married Jermaine Elliott Peralta of Seattle after many years as a bachelor simply shows that even when his colleagues joke they recognize the honesty of his motives.

Sen. Phillip A. Hart of Michigan noted in a Senate speech that the Senate Commerce Committee was a passive arbitrator of industry disputes before Magnuson changed its direction. Now, he said, "it is a bold innovator of consumer legislation."

Out of Magnuson's committee came truth-in-packaging legislation, auto and tire safety measures, and the cigarette labeling bill. After a series of hearings, Magnuson's committee introduced measures to control pesticides and require safe designs of pop bottles, power mowers, electric blankets, teething rings, gas pipes, and hundreds of other products. His committee also has drafted legislation designed to end the practices of unscrupulous money lenders.

There is a big difference between introducing bills for the purpose of being identified with a cause and introducing bills with the intent of directing them through to passage. Magnuson's bills become law. He has been around the Senate long enough to have learned how to use his power effectively.

But more than power and position explain his influence. He has the respect of other Senators. A newspaper writer in Washington has said that fellow Senators don't just like Senator Magnuson; they trust him. "Everybody knows 'Maggie's' not out to do anybody in," a colleague explains. "He has no further political ambitions, so he's not trying to take anything away from somebody else."

Perhaps the Magnuson style is a tribute to his memory for another day. He was orphaned at the age of three weeks; he grew up as the adopted son of a Swedish family in Minnesota. At the age of 17 he set out for Seattle, doing farm labor between rides on freight trains. In the next seven years he attended the University of Washington and the law school. During the summers he delivered ice, and he was a member of Ice Wagon Drivers Local 192. He and Rep. Lloyd Meeds both are former Teamsters—Meeds as

a cannery worker in Monroe was a member of Local 788.

The guess that Senator Magnuson is an unlikely entry in Statuary Hall is a tribute to his unassuming manner. On the rise to his present position of power he has done those things that honored men do. He took leave from Congress and saw action in the Pacific during World War II as an officer aboard the aircraft carrier Enterprise; he directed the public accommodations section of the 1964 civil rights bill through his committee. But he did his work without attracting shells. Though Southerners opposed the civil rights bill, Magnuson kept their respect.

If Magnuson can never be a hero to the mop-hairs, because of the style gap and age differences, the political consequences may be minor. Among the young are persons whose political preferences are based on performance. In this respect they are just like their parents. When these people look at Senator Magnuson in 1968, when he will be 63, they will not expect him to have hair hanging over his eyes. They will expect him to talk about his part in making the world better. His part is big, and the young who have heard him talk about health and education respond to him because there is much he has done and much he knows.

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in light of the current consideration by the Congress of the problem of the growing AFDC program, I wish to bring a recent article by Sylvia Porter to the attention of the Senate.

Miss Porter describes an experimental program underway in New York City which will provide day care facilities for mothers who wish to undertake training or paying jobs. Thousands of women in this country are trapped in poverty because the care of young children precludes them from taking jobs outside their homes. This new program in New York City will permit a mother to take a job knowing that her children will be cared for properly in her absence. It has the additional advantage of providing valuable experience and extra funds to other welfare mothers who are trained to take care of the children.

I wish to commend Mayor Lindsay's administration and particularly Mr. Mitchell Ginzberg, commissioner of welfare, for the innovative and common-sense approach to a problem which deeply concerns us all. They have initiated a program which will benefit the mother, the child and the community.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELPING MOTHERS OFF WELFARE (By Sylvia Porter)

Imagine yourself in this position: you are the mother of three pre-school children, living in a city slum on \$200 a month in welfare payments. You would like to enroll in a job training course to become a hospital worker, but you obviously can't leave your children at home alone, and the cost of paying babysitters would be nearly as much as you would be receiving as a hospital trainee. Furthermore, you would have to forfeit your welfare check if you did take a paying job.

What would you do? You probably would forget about the job training and the job, give up the idea of self-support, stay home—and on the dole. And this is, in fact, pre-

cisely why hundreds of thousands of women are on welfare rolls the nation over. This is a key explanation why there now are a record 5,000,000 parents and children on the Aid to Families with Dependent Children rolls—and why 200,000 are being added to these rolls each year.

This is the predicament which has caused so many well-meaning job training programs for welfare mothers to be dismal flops, and locked millions of children into dependency and poverty generation after generation.

Now, however, New York City is launching a vitally important experiment to overcome this costly paradox.

Beginning early in October, groups of two to four welfare children, aged one to five, whose mothers want to take paying jobs or job training in public or private agencies, will be assigned to the homes or apartments of other nearby welfare mothers from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. The children will be fed proper lunches, take naps, play in parks, etc. The mothers caring for them will receive \$75 per child per month from the city—or up to \$3600 a year.

As an incentive, these mothers will be allowed to keep the first \$150 in monthly earnings, with no reduction in their regular welfare payments. Payments will drop after that, as the mothers become financially self-sufficient.

The mothers also will become eligible, as a result of their experience in child care, for "para-professional" jobs in various anti-poverty programs, including home helpers, day care aides in city day care centers, and day care counselors.

As an indication of the desperate need for family day care facilities for children, New York City had, as of this summer, space in homes for only 200 welfare children, plus group day care centers accommodating only 5000 children. Yet there are painfully long waiting lists for these facilities and meanwhile more than 100,000 New York City welfare mothers who might take jobs or job training are unable to do so. The story is similar in cities throughout the U.S. The national estimate is that 300,000 welfare mothers could be trained vs. only 50,000 now actually in training.

What payoff is expected from New York's baby-sitting plan? For every two to four welfare children placed in day-care homes, two mothers are likely to work themselves off the relief rolls along with their dependent children. Since it costs up to \$3000 a year to support one family on welfare in New York City, officials predict that savings over a two-year period will amount to at least \$3 million.

The fact is that hundreds of thousands of welfare mothers the nation over would like to work and to leave behind the humiliation of being on welfare. If they can find a way to, and a place to care for their children, they will.

POSTAL RATES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, Newsweek magazine for October 16, 1967, contains a column by Raymond Moley on the subject of postal rates. This is a subject that has occupied considerable attention in Congress this year. Mr. Moley cast a perspective on the subject of postal rates that I believe should be brought to the attention of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that his column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE ALLEGED POSTAL SUBSIDIES (By Raymond Moley)

A House bill to raise postal rates and increase the pay of postal employees (H.R.

7977) has been passed by the Post Office Committee and cleared for floor action by the Rules Committee. This bill is a hybrid. Originally there were two bills—one to comply with the President's demand for higher postal rates and the other to raise the pay of postal employees. The latter, however, gave employees a raise higher than the President's guidelines for Federal employees. And so, to avoid a veto of the pay bill, the House committee combined the two into one piece of legislation. Thus, the present bill is a product of a political maneuver, a practice which from time immemorial has characterized almost everything related to the postal service.

Moreover, this bill is being rushed through despite the fact that a commission of distinguished people was appointed by the President to study the postal service and will not report until next year. The chairman of that commission is Frederick R. Kappel, former chairman of AT&T. The commission was no doubt appointed at the instance of Postmaster General O'Brien, who declared that the "archaic" postal service is "ponderous, creaking, erratic, costly."

THE BURDEN UPON USERS

Instead of waiting for the Kappel commission's report, which may well show how the Post Office can be reformed to the extent that most of the postal deficit can be eliminated, the House Post Office Committee chose to increase the present scale of rates and thus throw the burden upon the users of the mail service.

My argument here deals with what is called a "subsidy" for users of second- and third-class mail. According to the figures in the House committee report, first-class mail in 1966 showed a surplus of \$67.7 million. But second- and third-class mail provided deficits of \$416.2 million and \$401.2 million respectively. For a long time figures like these have been used to claim that users of second- and third-class mail have enjoyed a huge Federal subsidy.

I have had reason to feel the effect of this claim, for whenever over the past twenty years I have in my pieces in this magazine commented upon subsidies in government agencies and programs, I have received letters taunting me about the "subsidy" enjoyed by periodicals. Until now, I have not replied to those charges in print. But since responsible journalists have now accepted the Post Office figures and have joined the chorus, I choose to show how deceptive those figures are. For I have always believed that these claimed subsidies have been based upon a wholly unsound system of allocating costs in the postal system.

BAD ACCOUNTING

The report of the House committee itself in its labored explanation of what are called "cost ascertainment" figures comes close to admitting their unreliability. The cost system does not, it admits, take account of the importance of the priority given to first-class mail as compared with the deferment imposed upon other classes of mail. Delivery of first-class mail is intended to be prompt and almost immediate. Second class should take two or three days, and third class about eight days. Calculations based on the sale of stamps or use of meters cannot be segregated by classes. They are used for all kinds of mail. And the whole basis of assigning costs to the three classes is based upon random samples. The minority report on the bill said: "The full committee had no opportunity whatever to study the cost ascertainment figures on which the rate increases are based . . . all rate adjustments are suspect because they are based on questionable and dubious statistics."

I have become so accustomed to government accounting in other fields that I have grown even more suspicious of the Post Office figures. In the benefit-cost ratio in some big water projects such as dams and water supply, the assumptions are ludicrous. In the

Department of HEW there are twelve accounting systems, and none of these has been approved by the Comptroller General's office.

Common sense should tell anyone that since the same men and women, the same buildings, mail trucks, trains, boats and even in some cases horses and mules are used for all classes of mail in varying volume, an allocation of respective class costs is substantially impossible.

In the postal service, 80 per cent of the costs are for labor, and labor is largely used in handling, carrying and sorting mail. Under the ZIP Code system, magazines must do much of this handling at their own expense. A first-class item is handled on the average fifteen times by postal employees. Magazines do nine of those handlings at their own expense.

Despite this continual pushing of rising labor costs upon the users of second- and third-class mail, the rate increases on second-class (122 per cent) and third-class (188 per cent) over fifteen years have been far more than for first-class mail (67 per cent).

Finally, it should be noted that the rate increases in the present bill fall relatively most heavily upon periodicals of small circulation. To the big, the increases are an unjustified burden, but to the smalls the proposed rates are a tragic blow. And these smalls include hundreds of special periodicals—cultural, religious, scientific, professional and fraternal.

Here is the example of *The Atlantic*. Its publisher, Frank M. Herbert Jr., told the Post Office Committee that the present bill would add to his costs \$8,800 for first-class mail, \$26,250 for second-class mail and \$52,800 for third-class mail. In all, this is \$87,850. His average profits over five years have been \$22,795. Thus, at one blow *The Atlantic* would either be destroyed or go deeply into debt. And this situation might well apply to hundreds of lesser-known periodicals.

THE BILL SHOULD WAIT

The reason why *The Atlantic* as well as many other magazines of small circulation use third-class mail is that their prospects are in limited categories and they cannot afford to solicit subscriptions in media with mass coverage. Mr. Herbert said that a one-page ad in the *Reader's Digest*, with a general circulation of millions, would cost \$50,000, but if he used that \$50,000 he could appeal through third-class mail to 800,000 selected individuals who would be suitable prospects for *The Atlantic*.

For these reasons, Congress should defer this bill until the Kappel commission reports on postal operations generally and recommends reforms such as are suggested by the Postmaster General. The billion-dollar postal deficit may be due to inefficiency and waste in the Post Office system itself. Certainly if the system is modernized and if it is possible to have an accurate accounting system, the stigma of "subsidies" should be removed from users of second- and third-class mail.

HIGH PRICES OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, 6 months of hearings by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Select Committee on Small Business have produced startling facts about the drug manufacturing industry.

Recently, Mr. George Squibb sent the committee a lengthy document in which he discussed the fact that high prices cannot be justified.

This disclosure by an eminent member of a drug manufacturing family is significant. I hope that by the time the committee has examined all facets of

the drug issue, industry and the consumer can find a common meeting ground whereby all groups can make common battle against disease, with reasonable and sufficient economic gain for all.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the *Milwaukee Journal* of October 10, dealing with the Squibb report, be printed in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

DRUG DEFECTOR

The drug price hearings of Sen. Nelson (D-Wis.) have produced impressive evidence of overpricing of prescription drugs—evidence that the drug industry has not been successful in refuting. Now some of the charges made by Nelson subcommittee witnesses have been supported, in effect, by a drug company executive.

George S. Squibb, former vice president and a consultant for the E. R. Squibb & Sons drug firm, recently distributed among industry leaders a 30 page statement in which he warned that high prices "cannot be justified satisfactorily." He rejected the industry argument that research expenses are the cause of high prices. He called upon drug makers to reduce their prices and profits voluntarily or face the prospect of government legislation.

Squibb's candor in defecting from the industry's propaganda line is commendable. The drug industry would be wise to study his advice.

REVENUE SHARING

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations for their adoption of a proposal which advocates revenue sharing. The Commission, which represents a broad range of talent and expertise from all levels of government, has performed a public service by focusing new attention on the necessity for revenue sharing.

It is unfortunate that the administration has not altered its position on the issue. Although both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General are members of the Advisory Commission, they did not attend the meeting at which this action was taken. However, I understand that Secretary Fowler's representative has said that the Secretary feels it is "premature" to consider revenue sharing. This statement is somewhat surprising viewed in the light of statistics recently compiled by the Treasury Department itself which show that fiscal 1966 Federal grants-in-aid payments to the States rose by 16 per cent over fiscal 1965. Furthermore, Federal payments have increased since 1953 every year with only one exception. As total Federal grants reached \$17.8 billion last year, is it premature to be concerned? I am proud to be a cosponsor of S. 1236, introduced by Senator HOWARD BAKER, of Tennessee, which proposes a responsible first step in this direction that could be initiated in the near future.

While reasonable men may have honest differences about the advantages of the various revenue-sharing proposals, it seems to me that we must all agree that the time is past due for serious consideration for alternate financing pro-

cedures. I urge the Treasury Department to review their own statistics and to explain, in light of the urgency of the problem, their reasons for opposition and whether its opposition is just at this time of budget crisis or is their opposition one of principle.

GREATER INSURANCE PROTECTION TO SMALL BUSINESS AGAINST CRIME

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on April 11 of this year I introduced S. 1484, cosponsored by 31 Senators, to afford small businessmen greater insurance protection against crime. Thereafter, our Small Business Committee held a series of public hearings on the impact of crime on small businessmen.

Our findings show, beyond any doubt, that small business in the United States is the principal target of crimes against property. These are the people least able to protect themselves. They are more often than not unable to afford night watchmen, security guards, burglar alarms, electronic surveillance systems, and other high-cost means of self-protection.

With narrow profit margins and meager reserves, a man's small business can be destroyed forever by one single burglary. And burglary alone took from the coffers of U.S. small business firms last year the staggering sum of \$679,668,000. An unconscionable percentage of this loss was not protected by insurance. For commercial insurance companies systematically avoid the urban neighborhoods where crime is most rampant. Since these companies are in business to turn a profit—who can blame them? But the small business victims—many the Mom and Pop store variety—would like to make a profit too. As a matter of fact, they would oftentimes just like to be able to stay in business. But crime is driving them out—sometimes to a safer neighborhood—sometimes to an early retirement and sometimes into bankruptcy. And always, the thousands of citizens of a blighted neighborhood are thereafter denied the convenience of shopping near home.

This whole recidivistic treadmill is a travesty upon our society. The case for a Federal program of small business crime insurance is documented and clear.

It is equally clear, however, that crime insurance must be coupled with crime prevention, just as Federal deposit insurance is tied into a rigorous program to avert bank failures. Furthermore, the flood insurance bill recently passed by the Senate has as one of its principal elements a strong loss prevention program.

No insurance program can go on forever piling up an excess of claim payments over premium income. On a plain and simple dollars and cents basis the actuarial risk must be kept to a minimum. In other words, if the program I have proposed in S. 1484 is going to work, the Government must pull out all stops in attacking crimes perpetrated against this Nation's 6 million small businessmen and women.

And if—spurred on by actuarial necessity—we can put a stop to most of these crimes against small businessmen—perhaps we can then apply the same principles to the auto thefts, the housebreakings, the muggings, the rapes, and the murders that are a plague upon American society.

During our Small Business Committee hearings in April, I sat and listened to witnesses—small business victims of crime—tell their fearful and sordid stories of defeat and frustration at the hands of hoodlums and punks. It occurred to me that the answer to this mess over the next 50 years might lie in the fields of psychology and sociology; that the answer over the next 5 years might be to unclog our criminal courts.

But that the answer today is to commit—to really commit—the scientific and technological resources of the most advanced Nation in all history to the prevention of these criminal acts against small business.

If we can master the mysteries of the atom, penetrate the historically impenetrable barriers of the universe, and circumnavigate the globe under the sea—surely we can muster sufficient scientific expertise to outwit the punks and hoodlums who prey upon our citizens.

With these thoughts in mind, I enlisted the aid of the Science Policy Research Division of the Legislative Reference Service. At my request, a very exhaustive study was made by Dr. Franklin P. Huddle, of the library staff.

I am pleased to announce that that very fine study has now been completed. Entitled "Contributions of Science and Technology to Federal Crime Insurance," it will be released by the Small Business Committee today.

With abundant documentation, the study shows that our failure to come to grips with crime has probably resulted from faulty assumptions and from a wealth of ignorance about all the elements of what constitutes crime.

Looking at crime prevention as a national system today, the study finds that it is a mass of disorganization.

There is no standardization of factual data about crimes.

Investment in the development of crime protection hardware is meager.

Community arrangements for protection vary from one jurisdiction to another.

Effective burglar alarms and associated hardware are too costly for many small businessmen to afford.

We do not have any one central location where the detailed quantitative facts about crimes can be collected, analyzed, and interpreted.

We do not have any mechanism for collecting such data in the first place.

No funds of any consequence are available to implement programs of research, development, and testing of hardware to protect small commercial establishments.

We do not even know what kinds of hardware would be most effective.

Individual police departments have experimented with specific techniques of crime prevention, but there is no means of evaluating these programs and their results, nor of encouraging the expanded application of successful ones.

All of these deficiencies could be substantially corrected if we were to apply the same systems engineering concepts to crime control that the aerospace industry has applied successfully in the design and construction of large, almost unbelievably complex, military and space projects. The study we are releasing today describes a practical program of how this can be done.

In partnership with a systems oriented scientific crime prevention plan, the small business crime insurance program—as envisioned in my bill, S. 1484—can become the most significant anti-crime legislation ever passed by Congress.

The Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE], advanced congressional consideration of this legislation with public hearings on September 13.

Both Senator McINTYRE and my very distinguished colleague from Alabama, Senator SPARKMAN, the chairman of the full Banking and Currency Committee, are doing an outstanding service to the small business community in their thorough and expeditious handling of this legislation.

The administration's Commission on Civil Disorders has also been studying the question of crime insurance for small business. Some spokesmen have suggested that the Congress delay any action on S. 1484 until the Commission's study has been completed and its recommendations have been advanced sometime next year.

It is unthinkable to me, in light of the evidence that Congress has already been presented and in light of the thorough and comprehensive study we are publishing today, that the Nation's small business community should be asked to wait for further studies to be completed.

These actions of burglary and robbery, of vandalism, are being perpetrated against small businessmen across the country every day. Their losses are multiplying. Far too often they have no recourse, and the legislation that the Congress finally passes will obviously not be retrospective.

I cannot urge too strongly that the Congress act at the earliest possible time.

Mr. President, during the course of the study that I have spoken about today, I received many letters of support from eminent law enforcement officials, and engineers and scientists in the aerospace industry. I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from that correspondence, together with other relevant material, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In discussing the application of systems technology to crime prevention, Charles Wilcox, manager of technology planning in Hughes Aircraft Company, Culver City, California, says:

"Inexpensive alarms, either using infrared or ultrasonics, are on the market in limited quantities now. Considerable improvement in these devices is possible. Nearly all the communication nets from a central station

to individual stores presently employ telephone lines. This may be satisfactory, but there exist other techniques employing active interrogators of inexpensive passive devices which have been developed for military use and which may have application here. Non-lethal weaponry has been receiving considerable attention for use in riot control and paramilitary operations. It would seem that much could be done here to prevent the occurrence of potential crimes as well as stopping those underway."

Mr. Joseph C. Batz, director of software support systems, Control Data Corporation, Bethesda, Maryland, writes:

"The significance of a national approach to solving the problems of small businessmen in obtaining effective protective devices is very important. It is my firm belief that if small businessmen do not have the funds or knowledge to provide themselves with protective devices, assistance should be provided."

Mr. George W. Boe, Jr., of the radar and intelligence operation, Aeronautics Division of Philco-Ford, in Newport Beach, California, states flatly that for the small businessman, burglary protection devices "which will provide the protection he needs for the price he can afford have not yet been developed." He says:

"The proposal to sponsor and support technological improvements in crime detection devices is valid. Research and development in this area is particularly expensive and to be borne solely by 'one' small business would be prohibitive. The idea of creating a crime protection insurance corporation with the charter for this responsibility is practical. I can think of no more expeditious manner with which to establish the capability."

The inadequacy of our knowledge about crime was stressed by LeRoy B. McCabe of System Development Corporation, Falls Church, Virginia. According to McCabe:

"There is a general indication that there is a problem, but to my knowledge very little effort has been expended in analyzing all the factors directly or indirectly involved in the small business environment. We have found in systems work that it is impossible to develop effective solutions to operational problems, for example, of a particular organization without knowing in fairly precise terms the structure, operational procedures, products, resources, etc., of that organization. The much discussed systems approach to problems solution seems to be a basic requirement for any proposed national entity established to assist in attempting to solve the small business protection problems."

Mr. Joel N. Bloom, technical director of the Franklin Institute Research Laboratories, in Philadelphia, writes:

"Insurance by itself would ameliorate to some extent the financial losses of small business due to robbery and burglary; but, it would not attack the fundamental problem of reducing the crime itself. The ideal solution to the problem is to combine a government-sponsored insurance program with a concomitant applied-research effort, specifically geared to the needs of the small business establishment. Then, it can be expected that low-cost, effective deterrent devices and procedures will be developed and put within the reach of small business. When this happens, the private insurance industry once again will be able to offer adequate coverage at moderate rates."

The report presents a number of illustrative approaches to crime prevention that have been successful in particular localities. One is the well-known "Oakland Ordinance," developed by the police department in the City of Oakland, California. This program is based on the well-documented fact that some victims of robberies and burglaries are hit repeatedly. (For example, one of the witnesses who testified at our Small Business Committee hearings said that he had been

burglarized 22 times since 1953; another said he had been burglarized four times in the previous five weeks).

The Oakland Ordinance assigns the municipal police department the task of conducting security surveys on "crime-prone" commercial establishments; the police experts suggest ways the storekeeper can tighten his security, and make his premises less inviting to the criminal.

The Ordinance requires the storekeeper to take the necessary protective action recommended by the police, and to do so in a reasonable time.

The Chief of the Oakland Police Department, R. J. Preston, has written to me, stating that:

"With the steadily increasing crime rate, the significance of a national approach of the kind you propose to assist small retailers by improving availability of effective protective devices cannot be over-emphasized."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the imperative need of the Nation's small businessmen for insurance protection is gaining widespread acceptance. As further evidence that the concept of the Federal Government taking the lead in making it possible for small firms in high-risk localities to obtain insurance protection, which is now unavailable through normal underwriting channels, I call attention to the editorial which appeared in the 50th anniversary special issue of "Building Supply News." This perceptive editorial is titled "Riot Insurance for Your Business." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIOT INSURANCE FOR YOUR BUSINESS

A Capitol Hill axiom is that Congress always learns its lesson the hard way. It is no exception to this rule that it took a whole summer of mob violence in the cities to make the lawmakers realize that riot insurance is a must if business establishments and homes in the damaged areas are to be rebuilt.

Moreover, as we brought out in the Senate hearings on housing legislation, it is futile to attempt to lure new businesses and homes into urban areas if protection against fire, and mob damage is unavailable—or can only be obtained at prohibitive rates.

Actually, a bill that would go a long way toward alleviating the situation has been pending in the Senate most of the session. Sponsored by Sen. George A. Smathers (D.-Fla.), it would set up a federal reinsurance program in areas that have been ravaged by mobs or are considered subject to such damage. The operation would be lodged in the Small Business Administration.

The measure has been taken down from the shelf and dusted off for action. Hearings are planned in the Senate Banking Committee early in September. Preliminary information already obtained by Senate staffers presents mute testimony as to the seriousness of the problem.

For example, it was reported that 873 businesses were wrecked in Newark. In Tampa, Fla., it was found that 60% of the losses suffered by businesses and stores was not covered by insurance.

Even more disturbing are the stories relayed by Senate aides that some retailers are finding suppliers and manufacturers reluctant to send them new shipments unless insurance protection can be provided against further damage and looting.

In its present form, the Smathers bill would reinsure private insurance companies writing prescribed policies protecting small

businesses against fire and mob damage. The contents of the buildings would be covered as well as the structures themselves, thus tending to make the suppliers less apprehensive.

WHAT'S A SMALL BUSINESS?

The determination of what constitutes a small business has never been very easy to figure—mainly because The Small Business Administration keeps changing its definitions. In the retailing field, a guideline is the establishment's gross volume of business.

However, the dollar limit varies according to the type of retailing. Consultation with SBA produces the information that for building supply retailers, the dollar limit is presently \$1 million.

But this does not necessarily indicate that retailers who take in more than \$1 million a year will be barred from the new insurance program. There is already talk around the Senate of raising all the limits to much higher amounts. According to one source, building supply retailers with annual gross incomes at least double the present \$1-million ceiling would be able to qualify.

Another SBA requirement for its present programs is that a retail establishment must be independently owned and operated and not dominant in its field in the area it serves. Unless modified, this regulation would obviously exclude retailers in smaller cities from the proposed reinsurance program—and some of these places have already experienced riots.

Homes are not now covered by the bill, but probably will be by the time it reaches the floor.

THE CLAMOR FOR DEESCALATION OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in a recent column, Crosby S. Noyes wrote in the Washington Evening Star that the clamor for deescalation in Vietnam may, indeed, have the ironical effect of drowning out the prospects for deescalation. This is so, he wrote, because the so-called doves who are playing politics with the war to put President Johnson in a tough political spot, refuse to recognize the realities of the situation; namely, that there is no willingness at all, and no sign of its likelihood, that Ho Chi Minh and the leaders of North Vietnam will listen to reason or come to amicable agreements.

Certainly it stands to reason that the clamor put forth by some for deescalation should harden Hanoi's determination to resist and to forgo the conference table, at least until after our elections next November. Those who truly seek peace, it follows, should not be acting in such a manner as to foreclose negotiations for such an extended period of time. That, alas, is the effect their campaigning seems to be having.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Crosby S. Noyes' column entitled "Clamor for Deescalation Drowns Out Prospects," published in the Evening Star of October 12, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLAMOR FOR DEESCALATION DROWNS OUT PROSPECTS

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

The crowning irony in the growing clamor for deescalation of the war in Vietnam is that it has seriously reduced the chances of any de-escalation and virtually eliminated any prospect for serious peace talks.

There are two obvious reasons for this.

President Johnson is now in a position in which he cannot respond to these pressures without appearing to cave in to the Republican peace wing and the doves within his own party.

And if it should appear that a new peace move by the United States was prompted by the administration's fear of defeat in the coming election, the Communists in Hanoi would have no reason whatever to come to the conference table before next November.

The emergence of the Republican peace wing in particular threatens to polarize and harden the administration's policies on Vietnam.

In the past Johnson has tried, with some success, to hold the middle ground between the hawks and the doves. Dissent within his own party has been something of a nuisance but not much of a threat.

In the past, the domination of relative hardliners within the Republican ranks has left him free to make a number of concessions to his Democratic critics—including the suspension on five different occasions of the bombing of North Vietnam.

Now, however, this situation has radically changed. The fact that a number of prominent Republicans, including several potential presidential candidates, have begun to carve out positions on Vietnam allegedly more "liberal" than the President's, severely limits his freedom of maneuver in the coming months.

And this by no means for domestic political reasons.

In fact, the President might well be tempted at this point to try another experimental pause in the bombing, if only to cut the ground from under his critics at home and abroad. It might well be good politics for him to do so.

But no President of a country at war can do something which would serve to persuade the enemy that his country's will to continue the war was on the point of collapse. And under the present circumstances almost any gesture of appeasement would be very likely to do just that.

The doves, in their sublime innocence, have an unshakable faith in the willingness of the leaders in Hanoi to listen to reason and come to amicable agreements if only we give them a chance. Perhaps the real reason for the much-discussed "credibility gap" is the steadfast refusal of these people to believe anything they are told if it doesn't conform with their own ethereal views.

Heaven knows, the leaders in Hanoi have tried their best to tell them. Every day for months on end, in press articles, radio broadcasts, and speeches of visiting dignitaries—all available in impeccable translation—they have made their objectives unmistakably clear.

Listen for instance, to the voice of the official newspaper Nan Dan:

"If the U.S. aggressors do not reconcile themselves to their defeat but keep blindly rushing along the criminal road, the Vietnamese people will fight on until they are left with no way to continue the war and must give up their aggressive design."

Or consider the friendly words of encouragement offered to his hosts in Hanoi by Comrade Lu Wei-chao, envoy from Communist China:

"The victories of the Vietnamese people once again prove the invincible force of people's warfare. They also prove that the U.S. imperialists are only paper tigers that can be completely defeated . . . At present they are stepping up the aggressive war in Vietnam, while continuing their peace talk scheme aimed at reversing their setbacks. But realities have shown that with regard to the U.S. imperialist aggressors we must firmly fight them in face-to-face confrontation and we will certainly defeat them."

Propaganda? Of course it's propaganda—and of a kind which is hardly designed to ease the way to a peaceful settlement of our differences over the future of South Vietnam. The doves, by playing politics with these problems, may succeed in putting President Johnson in a tough political spot. But they are certainly doing nothing whatever to bring peace any closer in Asia.

DIRKSEN, OF ILLINOIS—VIETNAM

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, recently the distinguished minority leader of the Senate made his views known on the presence and aims of the United States in Vietnam. That subject has been discussed a great deal.

The remarks of Senator DIRKSEN and others, both preceding and following his presentation on the floor, have been widely publicized and discussed. They were the subject of an editorial contained in the October 6, 1967, issue of the Chicago Tribune.

In my view, the commentary of that eminent journal should be of interest to our colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIRKSEN OF ILLINOIS

Everett M. Dirksen spoke as Republican leader of the Senate in his impassioned speech supporting the presence and aims of the United States in Viet Nam. His address required a particular kind of courage, for some of his party colleagues in recent days have engaged in notable wobbling on a war which they originally supported.

Sen. Dirksen's address was directed as much to them as to the disaffected ranks of the Democrats who have walked away from the President of their own party. Sen. Dirksen defended the war against communist aggression and maintained that the people of South Viet Nam must be allowed to determine their own destiny without the pressures of communist arms and terrorism.

America's defensive perimeter in Asia, Sen. Dirksen said, extended from South Korea to South Viet Nam, and, if it were breached, we would be forced back to a holding line from Alaska to Hawaii.

Sen. Dirksen was especially vehement about criticism which he felt disparaged and demeaned the President. [One of his party colleagues, adopting Gov. Romney's celebrated utterance about being "brainwashed" on Viet Nam, had charged that Mr. Johnson was brainwashed and that he in turn was brainwashing the American people.] Sen. Dirksen was also contemptuous of headline hunters in his party.

To senators who had called for a unilateral cease-fire, the senator responded: "We tried that in the Korean war. The pause in our offensive then eventually cost us 90,000 additional casualties. Do we want to repeat that? Isn't one lesson enough for us?"

We think that Sen. Dirksen has spoken the sentiments of the majority of the American people. As Col. Robin Olds, the valiant fighter pilot, remarked in Washington on the same day, the way to stop the war is to win it. Instead, Col. Olds said, "We're doing it the hard way. And the worst way of all is to get out once you've got your foot in it."

Sen. Dirksen's outspoken statement again attests to his stature. If he were 10 years younger, he would be the choice going away for Republican nomination for the Presidency next year.

FARMER GROWING WEARY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, one of the most candid discussions of the plight of the American farmer is contained in a recent editorial by William O. Dobler, editor of the Lincoln Star.

It is worth noting that the Star frequently supports the Johnson administration and has, traditionally, been considered a Democratic paper.

But Mr. Dobler puts partisanship aside in commenting on a recent meeting in Lincoln between officials of the Department of Agriculture and Nebraska farmers to discuss the 1968 feed grains program.

The editor notes:

The American farmer, quite properly is growing weary of producing food for the enjoyment and profit of everyone but himself.

And, the editorial notes, the farmer is growing weary of unfulfilled promises and doubletalk on the part of the department of Government to which they look for assistance.

Unless the Department of Agriculture provides a realistic 1968 feed grains program, Mr. Dobler warns, "agriculture may well enter a stage of unprecedented revolution."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dobler's column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN PERSPECTIVE

(By William O. Dobler)

It takes no expert these days to figure out that the Johnson administration has problems in Nebraska beyond the Vietnam war and unrest in the big city slums. The trouble out here in the Plains states has to do with farming and the lack of profit in it.

This was made clear to U.S. Department of Agriculture officials in Lincoln this week for meetings with farmers in anticipation of 1968 feed grains determinations later this month. The farm groups were unanimous that something different was going to have to be done for next year.

These farmers spoke as reports showed a nine per cent drop in farm prices as of Sept. 15 compared with a year ago and a three per cent hike in the cost of production items. Thus, while farmers are paying more for the things they need to produce food, they are getting less for their products.

It is obvious to even the most casual observer that this cannot go on. The farmers were told a few years ago that once the great surplus stocks reduced, their problems would be over.

The surpluses have now been eliminated but farm prices have grown worse, not better. Additionally, the U.S.D.A., has seen fit to eliminate acreage diversion payments for 1967, taking another \$50 million out of Nebraska farm income this year.

One farm spokesman in Lincoln stated when the fall bills become due, farmers will not be able to pay them. Another pointed to the fact that farmers were doing business on seven to eight per cent credit while netting less than five per cent on their investment.

And finally, the U.S.D.A. was told that its crop predictions are in error, that thousands of acres of corn and sorghum have been damaged by frost to the point where they will yield no harvest. This is cash down the drain, regardless of the profit picture.

It was predicted that farmers will turn upon the 1968 feed grains program if changes are not made. This means that price supports will have to be increased and, probably, payments made for diverted acres.

The U.S.D.A. spoke of growing world production and the price-depressing nature of such conditions. It warned that rather than a surplus, the farmer now faces the problem of "supply-demand . . . to which a third equation must be added—namely, reasonable returns to producers.

We do not pretend to know what the department is talking about when it mixes up its words like this. We rather doubt that there are many farmers who know what the department is talking about.

What we suspect is that the department is, again, talking about the welfare of the consumer. Right or wrong, this cuts no mustard with the farmer.

The American farmer quite properly is growing weary of producing food for the enjoyment and profit of everyone but himself. He is growing weary of an always promising future that never quite materializes.

He should be growing weary of an American public that does not seem to understand its real and long-range interest in this matter. That interest is a continuation of agriculture along lines that now prevail.

The alternative is an organized agriculture that will state its price, take its full profit and let the consumer suffer. And this would be a much more advanced economic level than it takes to make present farm operations reasonably profitable.

There have been farm crises in the past and the nation has weathered them but we are facing one today that could be the end of the line. If the U.S.D.A. fails to provide a realistic 1968 feed grains program, agriculture may well enter a stage of unprecedented revolution.

COMMENTS ON NEWS CONFERENCE OF SECRETARY OF STATE RUSK

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Secretary of State Dean Rusk's news conference of last Thursday has drawn many comments, most of them favorable. It was hard hitting. It was direct. Secretary Rusk answered the critics of U.S. policies in Vietnam in explicit words. I ask unanimous consent to have the transcript of the entire news conference printed in the RECORD, along with an editorial from Saturday's Evening Star and Gould Lincoln's column on "Rusk's Explicit Reply to Critics," also from Saturday's Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY RUSK'S NEWS CONFERENCE OF OCTOBER 12, 1967

Secretary RUSK. I should like to begin with a brief comment on the current public discussion of Viet-Nam.

I find no significant body of American opinion which would have us withdraw from Viet-Nam and abandon Southeast Asia to the fate which Asian communism has planned for it. Similarly, I find no serious opinion among us which wishes to transform this struggle into a general war.

We Americans are, therefore, debating variations on a theme—but the theme is a central position resting upon (a) the need to meet our commitments and defend our vital national interests; (b) the pursuit of our limited objectives by limited means, and (c) our earnest desire to bring this conflict to a peaceful conclusion as soon as possible. Hanoi particularly should not misunderstand the character of this debate.

Our commitment is clear and our national interest is real. The SEATO Treaty, approved with only one dissenting vote by our Senate, declares that "Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area . . . would endanger its own

peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger . . . The Treaty says "each party" will act. The fidelity of the United States is not subject to the veto of some other signatory—and five signatories have engaged their forces alongside Korean and South Vietnamese troops. Indeed, the proportion of non-U.S. forces in South Viet-Nam is greater than non-U.S. forces in Korea.

In August 1964 the Congress by joint resolution declared, with only two dissenting votes, that "The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia." This was not a new idea in 1964. It was the basis for the SEATO Treaty a decade earlier. It is no less valid in 1967. Our several alliances in the Pacific reflect our profound interest in peace in the Pacific, and in Asia where two-thirds of the world's people live, no less vital to us as a nation than is peace in our own hemisphere or in the NATO area.

I have heard the word "credibility" injected into our domestic debate. Let me say, as solemnly as I can, that those who would place in question the credibility of the pledged word of the United States under our mutual security treaties would subject this nation to mortal danger. If any who would be our adversary should suppose that our treaties are a bluff, or will be abandoned if the going gets tough, the result could be catastrophe for all mankind.

It is not easy for our people to wage a struggle by limited means for limited objectives. We Americans are an impatient people—a quality which has helped to build a great nation. The present impatience about Viet-Nam is thoroughly understandable—and is shared by those who carry official responsibility. But our over-riding object is—and must be in this modern world—the establishment of a reliable peace. It is easy to rush into total catastrophe. It requires courage and determination to act with both firmness and restraint in the interest of peace. An examination of all the crises in which we have been involved since 1945 will show, I think, the supremacy of the objective of a reliable peace.

President Johnson has emphasized, time and time again, his interest in a prompt and peaceful settlement of the present struggles in Southeast Asia. Just two weeks ago, in San Antonio, he said:

"The United States is willing to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Viet-Nam when this will lead promptly to productive discussions. We, of course, assume that while discussions proceed, North Viet-Nam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation."

Can there be a more reasonable proposal? Is there anything unfair about such a simple proposition? Is it not clear that if Hanoi is interested in peace it could say "yes" publicly or privately to the President's offer?

A rejection, or a refusal even to discuss such a formula for peace, requires that we face some sober conclusions. It would mean that Hanoi has not abandoned its effort to seize South Viet-Nam by force. It would give reality and credibility to captured documents which describe a "fight and negotiate" strategy by Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese forces. It would reflect a view in Hanoi that they can gamble upon the character of the American people and of our allies in the Pacific.

Earlier I referred to variations on a theme. The debate in which we are now involved is essentially a debate about detail—this or that military move, this or that diplomatic step—this or that formulation of what is in fact a common middle position. If that be true, precision is important. People at least should make it clear whether they are arguing with Washington or with Hanoi.

When people talk about a pause in the

bombing, they should know that Hanoi calls a pause an "ultimatum." When a Senator says that he wants to stop the bombing but, of course, wishes to continue to bomb in support of our Marines south of the DMZ, he should know that Hanoi categorically rejects any such notion. When people say "Negotiate Now" they should know that the President would meet with Ho Chi Minh and other Chiefs of State concerned, tomorrow—and that I would depart today for any mutually convenient spot if I could meet a representative of North Viet-Nam with whom I could discuss peace in Southeast Asia.

Chairman Thieu and Prime Minister Ky have repeatedly offered to meet with the authorities of Hanoi to arrange a cease-fire and a peaceful settlement. They and we both responded affirmatively to U Thant's proposals of last March. Had there been a similar response from Hanoi, there would have been discussions to arrange a military standstill, preliminary conversations and a convening of the Geneva Conference. Literally dozens of proposals made by ourselves, other governments or groups of government's have been rejected by Hanoi.

I cannot tell you when peace will come. I am encouraged by progress toward peace in South Viet-Nam, but I cannot name a date. But we shall continue our effort both by resisting those who would impose their solutions by brute force and by an unremitting exploration of every path which could lead to peace.

I am ready for your questions.

Question. Mr. Secretary, with regard specifically to President Thieu's offer, reported offer to meet with Hanoi and then arrange a week's pause in bombing if they agreed to talks, one, was the United States consulted on this offer first, and did it agree, and, two, do you think such a limited offer has any chance of success?

Answer. My understanding is that a press officer repeated what President-elect Thieu had said during his campaign, I think in August. And that this was not itself a new development. Of course, we would be very much interested in Hanoi's response to such a suggestion.

The problem is that dozens and dozens of suggestions have been made to Hanoi through all sorts of channels, with all sorts of formula, and that Hanoi has categorically rejected all of them.

Now, this is the sort of an idea which is no problem for Washington. What is needed is some response from Hanoi to this or any one of a dozen other ideas with which Hanoi is thoroughly familiar.

Question. Mr. Secretary, some question has arisen in connection with the report from Saigon today as to whether the United States was consulted about President Thieu's proposed move, and how President Thieu can make a bombing offer when he is not doing the bombing.

Answer. Oh, I think there is no problems between ourselves and the Government of South Vietnam on that. We have had at least five substantial cessations of the bombings. Everything turns on what Hanoi's attitude is. We and the Government of South Vietnam keep in close touch on these matters, but the answer does not come just from Saigon and Washington. The answer must come from Hanoi as well.

Question. Mr. Secretary, you talked in your statement about the importance of precision, and with that in mind, sir, I wonder if you could help us understand whether the United States now still requires a military sign of deescalation from Hanoi in exchange for cessation of the bombing, or whether the President's statement about assuming Hanoi will not take advantage of a bombing pause represents a change.

Answer. Well, I think we ought to be clear that as far as the United States is concerned, we would engage in negotiations without any

conditions whatever at the earliest possible moment. I frequently said we will do that today.

Now, the other side has raised a major condition. That condition is a permanent and unconditional cessation of the bombing. And they have also indicated that they will take no corresponding military action on their side but would expect to go ahead with their part of the war with complete intensity, with all of the effort that they can mobilize.

Now, President Johnson in San Antonio stated an assumption. This is an assumption with respect to the condition imposed by Hanoi. The assumption would be that if we stopped the bombing there would not be military advantage taken by that cessation of the bombing by Hanoi.

Now, Hanoi knows what this means, and we have had not the slightest indication that Hanoi is prepared for those prompt and productive talks to which the President alluded in his San Antonio reference.

Question. Mr. Secretary, you said you were encouraged about the prospects of peace in Vietnam. Why are you encouraged in view of the lack of reaction from Hanoi?

Answer. Well, there are many things. I know that some reporter in Saigon invented the word "stalemate". Our military authorities do not believe there is a stalemate. Ambassador Bunker doesn't believe there is a stalemate. We see defections from the Viet Cong double what they were last year. We see the recruitment of southerners to the Viet Cong dropped by approximately a half. We see desertions from the South Vietnamese Forces sharply reduced over last year.

You have heard General Larsen's report on what is happening in the II Corps area, which is half the land area of South Vietnam, the opening up of roads, the opening up of railways, the areas under Government control, the sharp reduction of areas under Viet Cong control. There are many indicators that the Government and Allied Forces are getting on with the job on the military side.

Beyond that, despite all the tongues-in-cheek despite all the skepticism, the South Vietnamese have come through with what really ought to be considered almost a miracle in politics.

In the midst of a dirty, tough, mean, guerrilla war, they have elected a Constituent Assembly; they have adopted a Constitution; they have had hamlet and village elections through the country; they have elected a President and a Vice President and a Senate; they will shortly elect a lower house of the Legislature, in a situation where the Viet Cong in most areas has said, if you vote, you die, and they are getting on with it.

Now, it is not easy, and we can sit back here comfortably and be skeptical about details, worry about this or that particular point, but the overriding fact is that in the midst of this kind of struggle, the South Vietnamese have been moving steadily toward a constitutional system.

Now, these elections were held in areas representing some 75 per cent of the population. A very high percentage of those who registered, voted favorably compared with our own elections in this country. The economic situation has been improving. In other words, the Viet Cong have not achieved their objective. The country is moving ahead. And I see no reason for us to be gloomy simply because it is not over yet. We have had our combat forces there for approximately two years, and other Allies have put forces in there, and the situation is moving.

Now, one can find individual incidents here and there that would throw doubt on it, and the skeptic can always find some basis for his story, but there are at least a thousand stories a day that could be filed from Saigon, many of them of success, many of them reflecting close cooperation, friendship, and acts of kindness among South Vietnamese and Americans.

When you look at the total situation it's

moving, and I have no reason myself whatever to subscribe to this notion of a stalemate. It is not a stalemate at all.

Question. Mr. Secretary, what is the motive of the Soviet Government to reject the reconvening of the Geneva Conference? Did you explore this with Mr. Gromyko in New York?

Answer. I find it difficult to get into motives. I would suppose that Hanoi categorically refuses a Geneva Conference, and therefore the Soviet Union is unwilling to step out in front and join with the British Co-Chairman to convene a conference to which Hanoi and Peking both strenuously object. We ourselves will be very glad to have such a conference convened, about Vietnam, about Laos, about Cambodia, or about any subject related to Southeast Asia.

A Senator the other day in the course of a Senate debate was asked what his alternative was for Vietnam, and he said, well, I would like to see a Geneva Conference. Well, he is not arguing with Washington. We have tried over and over again to use the Geneva machinery for the purposes for which it was established. We will be glad to see the two Co-Chairmen say, go to Geneva, and put themselves in touch with elements or parties in the dispute. We would be glad to have the three ICC countries do the same thing or to make arrangements for the demilitarization of the DMZ or to assure Prince Sihanouk that Cambodia's neutrality will not be abused.

So there is no problem with us on that. The problem is that Hanoi says no.

Question. Mr. Secretary, what do you think of the thesis of turning negotiations upside down and beginning instead between Washington and Hanoi at some lower level within the countries, specifically between the Government of Saigon and the NLF, or elements of it?

Answer. Well, we, as you know, draw no major distinction between what is called the NLF and Hanoi. I think that the United States view is affected by the fact that as far as peace is concerned, our problem is with Hanoi. We did not put our combat forces into South Vietnam because of dissident elements in South Vietnam. We put our combat forces in there because North Vietnamese Forces moved into South Vietnam. So that our problem of peace is with Hanoi.

Further than that, we know from captured documents, testimony of prisoners, and other sources of information that the NLF is directed from Hanoi on a daily basis.

Now, we have no objections to exploring the possibilities of contacts with the NLF, nor do we have any objections to the Government in Saigon doing so. But I would not want to mislead you by thinking that in my judgment that is going to solve the problem of North Vietnamese regiments in South Vietnam for the purpose of imposing a solution on that country by force. Hanoi has a major role to play in peace in this situation, and until there is some indication from Hanoi that they are prepared to make peace, then I don't think that lesser formulas are likely to solve the problem.

Question. Mr. Secretary, on the same day the Russians ratified the Outer Space Treaty and announced their biggest ever rise in their arms budget. Would you please appraise the relative weight of these two events in U.S.-Soviet relations?

Answer. Well, as far as the arms budget is concerned, I believe that the defense budget as they announced it is about the same proportion of their new budget as it was in the previous budget. In any event, it indicates some increase. Just what direction that increase will take we have no way of knowing. There was some indication that it related to the need for more military assistance to other countries. And we know that they are increasing their military assistance to

North Vietnam. But it is true that we signed the Space Treaty, and I think it is worth pausing to reflect a little on 1967 despite Vietnam. It turns out to be a most constructive year. The Kennedy Round negotiations were successfully concluded. The International Monetary Fund took a major step in the field of international liquidity. The Space Treaty was ratified unanimously by our Senate. We concluded the Consular Treaty with the Soviet Union. We and the Soviet Union filed a joint draft of a non-proliferation treaty in Geneva. The Presidents of the Western Hemisphere decided to go for a Latin American Common Market in this next decade. The Asian Development Bank became a going institution this year. Even though there was a distressing and sharp war in the Middle East, the fighting was ended in four days without the intervention of the great powers.

In other words, there have been some very constructive developments this year looking toward a general peace and a general solution of problems despite the pain and the tragedy of Vietnam. We should not be negligent of those important developments.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in a speech in the Senate yesterday, Senator Fulbright asserted that the United Nations is being deterred from action concerning Viet-Nam more by the failure of the United States to encourage it to act than by the opposition of the Soviet Union. What are your views on that, sir, and what role do you think the United Nations can play?

Answer. Well, I don't have his statement in front of me. I—relying upon the way you stated it—

Question. Would you like for me to get it verbatim?

Answer (continuing). Would say that it is not true. The United States would be glad to have the United Nations take up this question and deal with it responsibly. We have pending in the Security Council a resolution which the Security Council does not wish to act upon.

I think the general attitude in the United Nations seems to be that since Hanoi and Peking and Moscow are saying that this is not appropriate for the United Nations, that an effort by the United Nations to resolve this problem might get in the way of the use of other machinery, such as the Geneva machinery or quiet, bilateral, diplomatic exploration.

Now, I have said many times that we ourselves do not share this view because we believe that the United Nations has a responsibility for general peace and security in the world and we'd be glad to see them take it up. But, on the other hand, there are some problems about going through an exercise of futility, if that is what it appears to be, to satisfy some critics among our own people.

We can't say to you that a resolution will come out of the Security Council because of the Soviet veto, and the Soviets have made it perfectly clear they will veto. And we have no reason to think that the General Assembly will address itself in this matter in the same way in which the UN is addressing itself to the Middle East. In the case of the Middle East, they have had a long association with these problems. They played the crucial role in establishing the State of Israel. They have had peace-keeping forces out there and they have had armistice machinery out there, and this matter has been before the United Nations year after year. They have the United Nations machinery for refugees in the area, but this is not the attitude in the United Nations about South Viet-Nam. I think that they are somehow hoping that other means and other procedures will find the key that will unlock this problem, when they are on notice by most of the parties concerned—that the United Nations will not be permitted to find that key and not be permitted by Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow.

Question. Mr. Secretary—

Question. Mr. Secretary—

Question. Mr. Secretary, may I ask, in view of a widely published report, whether in your non-public appearances around the country you are denouncing the intellectual critics of the war, including Arthur Schlesinger, and whether as reported you have dismissed Roger Hilsman.

Answer. No; I am not going to comment on third-hand reports on what I was alleged to have said in a private meeting. These things get out of context very quickly.

It is not true that I have any generic attitude toward all those people who call themselves or are called intellectuals.

I've been around them a good deal in my time.

I do recall, once in a while—perhaps you will forgive me for this—as friends used to say of Einstein—that was a genius in mathematical physics, an amateur in music, and a baby in politics.

Now, I think that an idea stands or falls on its own merits and the fact that a man knows everything there is to know about enzymes doesn't mean that he knows very much about Viet-Nam or how to organize a peace or the life and death of nations.

So I have great respect for intellectuals, but I don't feel that I'm intimidated by them. (Laughter.)

Question. Mr. Secretary—

Question. Mr. Secretary, you said in your opening statement that essentially we are engaged in a debate about detail, but the record would indicate that there has been increasing defection in the ranks of Administration supporters in the Congress. Do you contemplate, sir, a further sequence of public appearances in the Congress to try to clarify, amplify this position?

Answer. Well, I'm not sure that as far as the Congress is concerned the way to clarify and achieve accord is through public appearances. I myself greatly enjoy serious, responsible, candid consultation with the great Committees of Congress in circumstances in which such discourse can take place. I do not think such discourse can take place always in open session. As far as I'm concerned, a public hearing has some of the same problems as does a press conference. There are very few secrets, if Americans can discuss these matters among themselves without the rest of the world listening in. But when our allies in the nonaligned world and the Communists are listening in, there are some inhibitions at least upon the Secretary of State, because what I say in my official capacity does have repercussions in other places.

Now, these repercussions don't occur when there can be private consultations in executive sessions.

Now, that doesn't mean that I'm opposed to public discussion. I have taken part in a good many of them and made a good many public appearances in the Congress. But in terms of exercising the great constitutional responsibilities of the President and of the Congress in the national interest, I think myself that close consultation behind closed doors is one of the better ways to do it.

We do have men engaged in combat. We do have some very serious and delicate problems in front of us. And these are not problems that can always be fully explored or resolved with the klieg lights and the rest of the world all looking on and listening in.

Question. Mr. Secretary—

Question. Mr. Secretary, I'm not clear yet on your explanation of the President's statement in San Antonio. Is that intended to modify, reduce, or leave ambiguous our terms, our conditions for a bombing pause in North Vietnam?

Answer. Well, I think we ought to just read the statement for what it says and reflect upon the absence of a response from Hanoi.

Now, you may wonder about the details of

this expression that they will not take advantage of a bombing halt. There's no point, as I have said before in these conferences—no point in my negotiating the details of that with you because you can't stop the bombing. We are prepared to discuss the details of that with Hanoi. They knew it—they know it. But the point I was making is this: It seems to me that this is an essentially reasonable and fair proposal for anyone who is interested in peace. And it seems to me that it is hard for anyone to reject this proposal without confessing at the same time that they are not interested in peace and that they propose to continue their effort to move in on Southeast Asia.

This is not, by the way, just a question of Viet-Nam. I have never subscribed to the domino theory; it's much too esoteric. There are North Vietnamese regiments today fighting in South Viet-Nam. There are North Vietnamese armed forces in Laos being opposed by Laotian forces. There are North Vietnamese-trained guerrillas operating in Northeast Thailand. There are Communist dissident elements in Burma who are being aided, encouraged, and helped from outside Burma across the Chinese frontier.

There was a major Communist effort in 1965 to pull off a coup d'etat against Indonesia. You don't need the domino theory. Look at their proclaimed doctrine and look at what they're doing about it.

Now, we would like to see peace in South Viet-Nam and in Southeast Asia just as quickly as possible. It takes two to make a peace; and we would like to see some indication from the other side that they accept the notion that all countries, large and small, as the UN Charter puts it, have a right to live in peace without molestation from across their frontiers.

When that moment comes, there can be peace very quickly, indeed; and the United States will be no obstacle whatever in making a peace on that basis.

Question. Mr. Secretary, do you foresee a greater effort or greater participation by some of the Asian allies in Viet-Nam, and what are the prospects for a meeting of the seven nations contributing troops there?

Answer. On the question of a meeting, the seven nations do keep in touch with each other by various means. There is no present time or date for such a meeting. We would expect that one might well occur, but that does not mean that we're not in continuing contact with each other.

As far as forces are concerned, this will be for each country to determine for itself; and each country would make its own announcements on that subject.

Of course, we would be glad to see additional forces from other countries involved in South Viet-Nam.

I do want to emphasize that the present effort is not negligible. South Viet-Nam has something like 700,000 men under arms. I think the comparable figure for us would be somewhere in the range of nine million compared to their population or any other measure you want to put on it.

The Laotian forces are engaged in Laos. The Thais are engaged in Northeast Thailand, in addition to what they have been putting into South Viet-Nam.

So that there is a significant effort by the countries of Southeast Asia to fend off this pressure from the North.

Question. Mr. Secretary—

Question. Mr. Secretary, I'd like to ask you on another subject for a second—whether you have satisfied yourself that the man killed in Bolivia within the week was indeed "Che" Guevara.

Answer. Well, I have no—when you say have I satisfied myself, I have no personal, independent proof. But, on the other hand, I have no reason whatever to doubt the reports which have come in from the Bolivian Government. And I am proceeding on the basis

that it was "Che" Guevara, and without any reason whatever to doubt it.

Question. Mr. Secretary, would you assess for us the stand of Soviet arms delivery to the Arab nations, especially in view of the conflicting estimates?

Answer. Well, I think I wouldn't want to get into figures. I've seen some estimates that appear to me to be too high. There was some significant resupply of certain of the Arab forces by the Soviet Union following the events of last June. We have, as you know, publicly, as well as privately, proposed that the principal arms-supplying countries get together with the countries in the area and try to find some ceiling on the arms race in that area. It is the one point on which we have been, I think, most disappointed up to this point; but I wouldn't want to try to straighten out figures, as between 60 percent or 80 percent and figures of that sort.

Question. Mr. Secretary, on the diplomatic front in the Middle East, there have been several U.S.-Soviet meetings on the subject lately. Does this diplomatic activity indicate that you're making any progress within the present framework on this subject? Can you report anything to us on that?

Answer. Well, in our business we work at such questions very hard, on the basis that progress is possible and that a good result can be achieved. We have not yet reached that result. It is, therefore, a little hazardous to indicate whether we feel that real progress is being made.

What is happening is private consultation among the countries in the area, or with countries in the area and among certain of the countries outside the largest powers, to see if we could find a basis on which there can be a permanent peace in the area.

Now, this turns critically upon the attitude of the countries in the area. At the present time I do not think that it turns upon major differences or conflicts among the great powers but, nevertheless, it is not easy for the great powers to agree among themselves unless they know what the attitudes of the countries in the area will be.

Now, I think this process is likely to continue. I don't think that time is working now on the side of a peaceful settlement. I think it is important for some movement to get started and that the United Nations has both a responsibility and an opportunity here in this situation.

So these discussions go on. They go on in great detail, with many governments. And I would hope that before too long we could find a formula which would move this situation toward that permanent peace which we desperately hope for, and which I think the ordinary peoples of the area would welcome if it could be obtained.

Question. Mr. Secretary—

Question. Mr. Secretary, one of the elements in the public discussion over stopping the bombing, particularly, in Congress, seems to be Senatorial worries about how the United States is regarded abroad. Senators have heard the opening debate in the General Assembly, where Foreign Minister after Foreign Minister has urged the United States to stop the bombing.

When you are confronted with a concern like that—I think almost 30 Foreign Ministers asked for a pause in the bombing—how do you reply to that concern. And, linked with that is Senator Cooper's proposal to stop bombing except on the infiltration routes above the DMZ.

A. Well, on the last point—a proposal to stop the bombing except on the infiltration routes would be categorically rejected by Hanoi; and not move us one inch toward peace, unless Hanoi makes a major change in its position. Your count on Foreign Ministers is a little higher than mine, in terms of stopping the bombing.

You know, I haven't found anyone in the world—private citizen, or public official, in

this or other governments—who have come to me and said, "If you stop the bombing, and there is no response from Hanoi, then our attitude would change."

I had a group of private citizens in not long ago to talk about this, and they wanted us to stop the bombing. I said, "All right, if we stop the bombing"—we have stopped it on a number of occasions—"If we stop the bombing and Hanoi does not respond, will you then change your view?" They said, "No, of course, not."

I could only say well, if we can't influence you by stopping the bombing, how do you expect us to influence Hanoi by stopping the bombing?

Now I would be glad to hear from any of these Foreign Ministers what their governments will do if we stop the bombing, and there is no response from Hanoi. And I want to hear that, I haven't heard it from anybody.

I do know what the British Co-Chairman would do if we stopped the bombing: Make a maximum effort to get this matter moved toward peace.

But, if Hanoi is saying "No," all the time, then he has very little chance. And, if the other Co-Chairman won't co-operate, there is very little chance.

So I would like to hear somebody tell me what they would do if we stopped the bombing. It is not just Hanoi who is not saying that.

Question. Mr. Secretary, on that point, is it not correct that this Government was informed by the Soviet Government, on the authorization of Hanoi, that if the bombing was stopped there would be a conference between the United States and North Viet-Nam within three or four weeks?

Answer. No, we were not informed that. We were not informed of that. There was a public statement by Mr. Kosygin, in London. But Hanoi has not said that, to our knowledge. Anyhow, just in case they should say it, why three or four weeks? Why not the next morning?

Question. Is that a material difference?

Answer. Well, I don't know. But I don't know what waiting for three or four weeks means.

But what we need—There is no one in the world who has been able to tell us what Hanoi would do if we stopped the bombing.

Now, we don't have to speculate about this; we checked this out with Hanoi. We don't have to speculate and engage in wishful thinking, and proceed on a hypothetical basis, and think that maybe the atmosphere would be improved. Of course, the atmosphere would be improved over North Viet-Nam. But what we want to know is "What would happen?" and Hanoi is not willing to tell us what would happen, and no one else is able to tell us what would happen. So, we want to hear something.

For us to say, "We will stop, you go right ahead with your war; you live there safely and comfortably, without being disturbed while you send your men and arms into South Viet-Nam for the next 50 years," where would be the incentive for peace?

Now, we are interested in peace; we are not interested in a sanctuary which will let them carry on these operations against South Viet-Nam and Laos for eternity; while they sit there in a sanctuary taking their own time, paying no price, trying to seize their neighbors by force. Now, let's not be children.

Yes.

Question. Mr. Secretary, one of the questions—basic questions—that seems to be emerging in this Senate debate is whether our national security is really at stake in Viet-Nam, and whether Viet-Nam represents an integral part of our defense perimeter in the Pacific.

Your earlier statement indicates that you think our security is at stake in Viet-Nam.

I think it would help in this debate if you would perhaps elaborate and explain why you think our security is at stake in Vietnam.

Answer. Within the next decade or two, there will be a billion Chinese on the Mainland, armed with nuclear weapons, with no certainty about what their attitude toward the rest of Asia will be.

Now the free nations of Asia will make up at least a billion people. They don't want China to overrun them on the basis of a doctrine of the world revolution. The militancy of China has isolated China, even within the Communist World, but they have not drawn back from it. They have reaffirmed it, as recently as their reception of their great and good friend, Albania, two days ago.

Now we believe that the free nations of Asia must brace themselves, get themselves set; with secure, progressive, stable institutions of their own, with co-operation among the free nations of Asia—stretching from Korea and Japan right around to the subcontinent—if there is to be peace in Asia over the next 10 or 20 years. We would hope that in China there would emerge a generation of leadership that would think seriously about what is called "peaceful co-existence," that would recognize the pragmatic necessity for human beings to live together in peace, rather than on a basis of continuing warfare.

Now from a strategic point of view, it is not very attractive to think of the world cut in two by Asian Communism, reaching out through Southeast Asia and Indonesia, which we know has been their objective; and that these hundreds of millions of people in the free nations of Asia should be under the deadly and constant pressure of the authorities in Peking, so that their future is circumscribed by fear.

Now these are vitally important matters to us, who are both a Pacific and an Atlantic power. After all, World War II hit us from the Pacific, and Asia is where two-thirds of the world's people live. So we have a tremendous stake in the ability of the Free Nations of Asia to live in peace; and to turn the interests of people in Mainland China to the pragmatic requirements of their own people, and away from a doctrinaire and ideological adventurism abroad.

Question: Could I ask just one follow-up question on that, sir?

Do you think you can fulfill this very large commitment of containment and still meet the commitment of the Manila Conference—to withdraw within six months after a peace agreement has been reached?

Answer. Oh, yes, I think so.

That does not mean that we ourselves have nominated ourselves to be the policemen for all of Asia. We have, for good reasons, formed alliances with Korea and Japan, the Philippines, the Republic of China, Thailand, Australia, and New Zealand; and South Vietnam is covered by the Southeast Asia Treaty.

That doesn't mean that we are the general policemen. Today, the Laotian forces are carrying the burden in Laos on the ground. The Thais are carrying the burden in Thailand; the Burmese are carrying the burden in Burma; the Indians are carrying the burden upon their northeastern frontier—the Sikkim border—and whatever other threat there might be in that direction.

But we have our part; we have accepted a share, and we have accepted that share as a part of the vital national interest of the United States.

Now what I don't understand is that Senators would declare in August 1964 that the United States considers it a vital national interest of this country that there be international peace and security of Southeast Asia. And, then, two years later, some of them seem to brush that aside as having no validity. Now that wasn't a Tonkin Bay reaction. Paragraph 1, was Tonkin Bay. Paragraph 2, was Southeast Asia—was Southeast Asia.

Now if people change their minds, then it is fair to ask the question:

"On which occasion were they right?"

Now I personally believe they were right in August 1964. And perhaps they will be right again if they come back to that position—1968 or '69.

But these are not matters that change with the wind. These have to do with the possibility of organizing a peace on a planet on which human beings can destroy each other. Now perhaps we could at least agree that that is the central question, even though there could be some debate about how you do it.

And I believe that those who think that you can have peace by letting one small country after the other be overrun have got a tremendous burden of proof in the light of the history of the past four decades; and they have not sustained that burden of proof.

Question. Mr. Secretary, would you describe the net objective here then as the containment of Chinese Communist militancy?

Answer. No. The central objective is an organized and reliable peace.

Now if China pushes out against those with whom we have alliances, then we have a problem, but so does China. If China pushes out against the Soviet Union, both China and the Soviet Union have a problem.

We are not picking out ourselves—we are not picking out Peking as some sort of special enemy. Peking has nominated itself by proclaiming a militant doctrine of the world revolution, and doing something about it. This is not a theoretical debate; they are doing something about it.

Now we can live at peace—we have not had a war with the Soviet Union, in 50 years of coexistence, since their revolution. We are not ourselves embarked upon an ideological campaign to destroy anybody who calls themselves Communist. But we are interested in the kind of world structure sketched in Articles I and II of the United Nations Charter, in which all nations, large and small, have a right to live in peace. And the aggressors nominate themselves—we don't choose them—the aggressors nominate themselves by what they say and do. And when they do, then those who are genuinely interested in peace have a problem on their hands, and sometimes it gets tough; and sometimes we are tested, and we find out what kind of people we are. And I think one of the most important historical facts in this post war period has been that the almost unbelievable power of the United States has been harnessed to the simple notion of organizing a peace in the world.

Question. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 14, 1967]

THE NEW DEAN RUSK

Dean Rusk came out swinging in his Thursday press conference, and we are glad of it.

For too long, or so it seems to us, the Secretary of State in his public appearances has been unduly restrained, overly courteous, in dealing with his growing chorus of critics. One result has been to leave the field in some measure to the complainers, to let them get away with outrageous attacks on the credibility of the administration in defining its objectives in Vietnam, to enable them to make some headway in denying that the United States has a legitimate national interest at stake in this war, and to permit them to cast doubt on whether there is in fact a Communist threat in Asia which cuts across our own vital concern with the future of an area in which two-thirds of the earth's people live.

We are fighting in Vietnam pursuant to an obligation assumed in the SEATO treaty and which Congress in 1964 reaffirmed with only two negative votes. Thus, we have made

our commitment and we must honor it in Vietnam. If we do not, if we waver on it, the word of the United States will not thereafter be worth a tinker's dam anywhere in the world.

But this is not all. As far as one can tell, the coming struggle in the far Pacific is already taking shape. One may hope that Communist China will emerge before long as a peace-seeking member of the family of nations. But that is not an assumption upon which rational planning can now be based. It has to be assumed that the militancy of Communist China is real, and that it will not be diminished at a time when it has a billion people and a nuclear arsenal.

The point Dean Rusk was making is that the United States now must shape its policies toward organizing the free Asian countries, in which another billion people soon will be living, into a force for peace. Will we do this by yielding to the senseless clamor for retreat or withdrawal in Vietnam? Of course not.

The Secretary of State put it this way: "I believe that those who think you can have peace by letting one small country after the other be overrun have got a tremendous burden of proof in the light of the history of the past four decades; and they have not sustained that burden of proof."

Indeed, they have not; nor can they. The memory of Munich is too fresh in the minds of living Americans for them to believe that a policy of appeasement that failed at a terrible cost in Europe can succeed in Asia. This is the point that the "new" Dean Rusk was making, and we hope to hear more of the same from him. There is too much at stake to let the critics go unanswered.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 14, 1967]

RUSK'S EXPLICIT REPLY TO CRITICS

(By Gould Lincoln)

"And sometimes it gets tough; and sometimes we are tested and we find out what kind of people we are."

In these three phrases, in almost nut-like brevity, Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated the situation which the American people face in living up to this country's commitment in South Vietnam, and its commitments to our SEATO allies in Southeast Asia and the Pacific. Rusk was speaking at an almost hour-long press conference, in which he dealt with all the questions raised by the opponents of the conduct of the war and those whose main concern is to get out of Vietnam and end the war at any price.

When the history of this era is written in the not too distant future, the stature of the Secretary of State, committed to the honor and security of the United States, will loom large, and even larger in comparison to those whose criticisms and actions have encouraged serious divisions among the American people.

Rusk stated in clear and understandable terms that the security of the United States is involved, as well as the security of the people of South Vietnam and the millions of people in Southeast Asia in other countries not now controlled by the Communist Chinese. They have been threatened and are threatened by Red China's efforts to launch so-called "wars of liberation" within their borders. The United States, as he pointed out, is a "Pacific" nation as well as an "Atlantic" nation, with Hawaii and Alaska, numbered among our fifty states. States which stretch far into Pacific waters, and are separated from the U.S. mainland.

Rusk revealed in their entirety the efforts of President Johnson and of the State Department to bring about peace in Vietnam; the efforts to obtain from Hanoi any assurance that it would agree to peace talks. He was caustic in his references to congressional critics of the administration's conduct of the war. He pointed out that virtually none of

these gentlemen are advocating immediate withdrawal of our military forces without some kind of peace talks and agreement with Hanoi and the Viet Cong.

"The debate in which we are now involved (with these congressional critics)," said Rusk, "is essentially a debate about detail—this or that military move, this or that diplomatic step, this or that formulation of what is in fact a common middle position. If that be true, precision is important. People at least should make it clear whether they are arguing with Washington or with Hanoi."

Rusk said he was encouraged about prospects of peace in Vietnam. He was asked why. "There are many things," he replied. "Some reporter in Saigon invented the word 'stalemate.' Our military authorities do not believe there is a stalemate. Ambassador Bunker doesn't believe there is a stalemate." Rusk enumerated: defections from the Viet Cong doubling this year over last, and their recruitment falling off by half; improvement in the South Vietnam military forces; and our military forces and our allies getting on with the job. There is no standstill, he argued.

Discussing the demands that we halt the bombing of North Vietnam, Rusk said he had talked with a group of private citizens recently. "I said; 'All right, if we stop the bombing and Hanoi does not respond, will you then change your view?' They said, 'No, of course not.'" He might have asked these people with justice: "Whose side are you on any way?"

Rusk's belief that there is no "stalemate," and that the progress of the war in Vietnam is favorable to the United States and its allies, is solidly supported by Hanson W. Baldwin, Pulitzer prize-winning military editor of the New York Times, writing in the current issue of *The Reporter*. Baldwin's criticism of the conduct of the war is that it could have progressed to a greater degree if there had been less delay in widening the list of bombing targets in North Vietnam. He writes:

"It is clear, or ought to be, from any summary of the war situation that the ultimate outcome of the war in Vietnam does not have to be defeat. In 1950-51 exactly the same derogatory phrases now being applied to South Vietnam were tagged to South Korea. The South Koreans would not fight; they had corrupt and political generals; Syngman Rhee was an Oriental dictator and an American puppet. It has taken fifteen years and there are still U.S. troops in South Korea, but all these sour predictions have been proved false."

THE BUDGETARY RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate recently a distinguished Senator on the other side of the aisle delivered a speech on "The Responsibility and Accountability of the President." In that address, the Senator espoused a new theory of the constitutional separation of powers.

For over 178 years—under the constitutional forms which have governed the conduct of our Government—the President has made budget proposals to the Congress and the Congress has examined those proposals and made its final decisions.

The President proposes a budget; the Congress acts upon the budget.

The Senator, however, has given us a new constitutional philosophy which is well summed up in his own words:

I submit with deep conviction that the man who makes the budget should cut the

budget. The President, assisted by the Department heads and the very able Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and with a staff of literally thousands, is far better qualified than individual members of the Congress to recommend these cuts.

Mr. President, for over 178 years we have operated apparently under the illusion that the Founding Fathers meant what they said when, in the Constitution, they gave the power of the purse strings to the Congress.

I have always believed that the 26 distinguished Senators who make up the Appropriations Committee, and their 51 counterpart Members of the House of Representatives, were conscientious men fulfilling their constitutional duty. They examine with care the proposals of the President. They then recommend to the Congress where the President's budget proposals might be cut or increased. But now, I gather, all of this activity has been a waste of time because—again to quote the very able Senator:

The man who makes the budget should cut the budget.

And yet, I must confess that this new interpretation of the separation of powers appears to be quite consistent with the position which in two votes last week on the continuing resolution, every Member of the minority party in the House accepted.

Those votes made a wholesale grant of constitutional authority to the President of the United States by ordering him to slash some \$5 billion from Federal expenditures, with no guidance as to where, or as to how, and with no criteria as to what programs shall be affected.

Now I submit that there has indeed been a failure of responsibility and accountability. But the failure is not the President's. He has made his budget recommendations. Last January he chose to cut some \$27 billion from the budget submissions of individual agencies and the military services. He made the hard and painful decision to ask for a tax increase. And now he asks that the Congress examine his budget expeditiously, and complete its action.

We in the Congress do have a responsibility. We are accountable for the final budget decision through the time-tested appropriations process. There is no way by which, with good conscience, we can ignore that responsibility.

The Senator, to whom I have alluded, and his party colleagues, apparently feel that a \$5 billion slash in Federal expenditures in fiscal 1968 would be a desirable reduction. But, I am sure he is aware that in order to reduce expenditures in this fiscal year by \$5 billion, it would be necessary to cut Federal programs by \$10 billion. Not all program costs occur in 1 year—so to cut \$5 billion in spending in fiscal 1968, one must cut programs by about twice that much.

Such a \$10 billion reduction in Federal programs would require a cut of over 25 percent in those activities which are subject to relatively immediate control.

We cannot, after all, default in paying interest on the public debt. We cannot change, through appropriation or budget action, the \$5 billion of compensation and pension payments to our veterans.

We cannot change, through budget action, the payments of the Treasury into the medicare trust fund. We cannot default on contracts already let. And so, to cut the amount which the Senator and his party colleagues in the other body seem to desire, would take a slash of truly monumental proportions in remaining programs.

Senators and Members of the other body have a perfect right to espouse such a reduction. But under our Constitution the Congress is responsible and accountable for such cuts. I truly hope those who are ordering these cuts will tell us if cuts are to be made in the farm loan program, or the education program, or the health research program, or the flood control program, or the rivers and harbors program, or the rural electrification program, or the highway program.

In summary, Mr. President, we do have before us a problem of accountability and responsibility. It is not the accountability and responsibility of the President which is at issue. Rather, it is the wisdom and propriety of the attempt by some Members of Congress to transfer to the executive branch the constitutional accountability and responsibility of the Congress of the United States for control of the Nation's purse strings. There lies the true failure of accountability and responsibility.

PROPOSED ANTI-VIETNAM RALLY

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the press has published accounts of plans by the National Mobilization Committee to stage a massive anti-Vietnam war demonstration in Washington, October 21.

Some press accounts assert that the committee plans to flood the headquarters of our Armed Forces—the Pentagon—with thousands of persons who would block the corridors, impede the movement of personnel, and hinder communications.

It seems unconscionable to me that if such action is indeed contemplated, it would be allowed to occur.

For reasons which have nothing to do with the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and assembly, the physical invasion of the Pentagon should be prevented by any means, including the use of troops and force, if necessary.

The building and the people who work therein are directly involved in the welfare of our men in Vietnam and the national security. The right to protest does not include the right to impose additional dangers on American servicemen; nor does it include the right to impair the national security, of which the Pentagon and its operations are a vital part.

If the National Mobilization Committee wishes to demonstrate in protest of the war, it has every right to do so. But that right should not cover the physical invasion of the Pentagon. And this, I reiterate, has nothing whatsoever to do with the rights of free speech and assembly.

I would hope and trust that the safety and integrity of the several thousand men and women who work in the Pentagon will continue to be respected and they will not be subjected to the untenable situa-

tion which the so-called National Mobilization Committee is alleged to have on tap for October 21.

BUSINESS ETHICS AND GOVERNMENT WASTE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, within the past few months we have had several reports of the Defense Department purchasing items of military hardware at prices outrageously out of reason. Examples of price markups ranging from 400 to 5,000 percent have been cited; the Department paid \$199.30 for a gear listed at \$3.43 by the manufacturer, \$25.55 for a small gearshift listed at 50 cents and \$32.13 for switches worth \$1.22.

These are only a few examples which dramatize the fact that there is waste of taxpayer dollars in the Defense Department's procurement program despite the concerted effort by Secretary McNamara to maximize the efficiency of his Department's spending operations.

Similar examples of wasteful procurement practices in other Executive Departments could be cited, for it is a simple fact that the topsy-turvy growth of the Federal bureaucracy over the past decade has inevitably resulted in considerable inefficiency and misuse of tax money.

Those who bring these incidents to public attention perform an invaluable service. But the elimination of waste and inefficiency requires much more than individual, piecemeal efforts. This is one of the reasons why I am convinced that a new Hoover-type Commission to study the operation of the executive branch and to recommend steps to assure efficient use of taxpayers' money is so absolutely vital and so urgently needed.

However, I speak today primarily for the purpose of discussing what I consider to be an equally important aspect of situations where the Federal Government pays excessive and unjustified prices for equipment and services purchased from private industry.

Whenever cases such as the Defense Department purchases cited above are brought to light, they are almost inevitably and universally treated by the news media and the general public as yet another example of bureaucratic bungling or political skulduggery. Reporters write front-page stories, editorials are issued, and radio and TV newsmen rush to the microphone, all proclaiming this to be another example of the general incompetency and low ethical standards of the Federal bureaucracy. We in Congress often join the chorus and the taxpayer is renewed in his conviction that the Federal Government is a vast organization devilishly designed to waste and misuse his tax dollars.

I have repeatedly spoken out against waste, inefficiencies and mismanagement and have worked for legislation which, I believe, would make a major contribution toward correcting such practices. Therefore, my remarks today cannot in any sense be interpreted as implying that I take these abusive practices lightly.

However, I think it is useful that from time to time we remind ourselves of the other side of the coin. When the Defense Department pays \$199.30 for a gear

worth \$3.43, it means that some bureaucrat or his machine has made an inexcusable, although sometimes understandable, mistake. But it also means that some businessman knowingly charged the Government an inexcusable price.

When waste of this type is reported, we often respond by declaring: If the Government were run in a businesslike fashion these kinds of things would not happen. I agree that the Government could and should learn a great deal from the business community, but I also note that whenever taxpayers' money is wasted in the Government purchase of items at excessive prices, two parties are involved, a bureaucrat and a businessman.

In effect, we have a schizophrenic attitude toward the public and private sector and we impose a dual standard. We are all opposed to unethical business dealings with the Government, but when it occurs we too often tend to only shrug our shoulders at the businessman and then rage at the Government for allowing itself to be "taken in."

The fact that a businessman knowingly overcharges the Government does not excuse the actions of the bureaucrat who authorizes the overpayment because he is not alert enough to spot the discrepancy. But it seems to me we make a serious error when we vent all our wrath on the bureaucrat and ignore the businessman.

Mr. President, relatively few individual businessmen and corporations knowingly overcharge the Government, but because this type of thing does occur, the Government must take elaborate steps to try to protect itself and thus, in the process, spends considerable time and energy, not to mention tax dollars.

Mr. President, I intend these remarks to be neither an open-ended commendation of the Federal bureaucracy nor a wholesale condemnation of the business community although I will not be surprised if they are treated as the latter. I do intend them as a reminder, for what it is worth, of the dual standard by which we so often judge the public and private sectors of our society.

NORTH VIETNAM NOW PREPARES FOR A PROTRACTED WAR

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Joseph Alsop, writing from Vietnam, has dispatched a series of columns which hold up much hope. In the last of his series, published in the Washington Post of Sunday, October 15, 1967, he detailed, from captured Vietcong documents, the plight of the enemy in the wake of Allied successes in defeating the big unit offensive of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong forces.

Now, Alsop writes, the North Vietnamese and their southern allies have fallen back to preparing for a protracted war that could last 20 years or more. This is guerrilla war. It amounts to an admission of defeat in the big unit war and promises nothing but problems for the other side. Writes Alsop:

The outlook is very hopeful now, in truth, provided the home front does not fall the U.S. soldiers in the line at the very moment

when the first great favorable turning point has seemingly been reached.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTRACTED WAR UP TO 20 YEARS IS LATEST WATCHWORD OF HANOI

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—"Our agencies and units are in a state of emergency. The sick rate in the rainy season is higher. Our cadres and troops are stricken with malaria and beri beri. The movement becomes more difficult. (However) the study of the appeal of Chairman Ho has increased our conviction and enthusiasm . . .

"Weak points: The fear of a protracted war is still prevalent and perceived under several different facets—the protracted war would cause death to many people, affect the morale of many families, the health of the soldiers and the physical condition of older cadres who could not fight this war to the end . . .

"The important action to be taken is to eliminate the ideology of balking at the difficulties and hardships of protracted war, the fear of the (enemy and) disease and death."

The foregoing rather grisly summary comes from a captured document reporting on the "Political Situation" of a group that has now been certainly identified as the military staff section of the Central Office South Vietnam. COSVN, as this agency is better known, is in fact the enemy's political and military high command in the South. Thus the foregoing may be roughly equated with a report on the state of affairs in Gen. William C. Westmoreland's headquarters.

The captured document concerns the situation of COSVN's military staff section in the third quarter of 1966, when the outlook for the other side in South Vietnam was infinitely more encouraging than it is today.

But what makes this particular document so intensely relevant at the moment is the ultra-heavy emphasis on the prevalent "fear of a protracted war." When the document was written, it must be recalled, the formula in use by the North Vietnamese Communist Central Committee was still "preparing for protracted war but seeking victory in the shortest possible time." At that period and indeed until very recently, the captured documents have abounded in assurances that this victory "in a short time" was easily attainable by a Dienbienphu-line defeat of American troops.

That phase has now ended, however, with the abandonment of the siege of Conthien and the publication of a gigantic article laying down a new party line by the North Vietnamese Commander-in-Chief, Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap. The hopeful second half of the old formula is conspicuously absent from the Giap article. Preparing for "protracted war" that may even last "up to 20 years" is the new watchword, with no talk at all about "victory in the shortest possible time."

The COSVN document helps to explain the Hanoi decision in 1965 to go forward with the big unit war despite the U.S. intervention. No wonder the late Gen. Nguyen Chi Thanh, then North Vietnamese commander-in-chief in the South, insisted on pouring in more and more big units, in vain pursuit of quick success, if the foregoing document accurately represented the state of mind of his own military staff!

Now, moreover, as indicated in previous reports in this space, the phase of true big unit war has at last been terminated by Hanoi. The new watchword of "protracted war" means something much more like classical guerrilla war, with a few big units, many cheap but sensational sapper operations, and a long effort to wear out American patience.

The change of policy was forced upon Hanoi, beyond any doubt, by manpower requirements to fill gaps in the line that had got wholly out of hand. It will take a long time—perhaps several months—for the change of policy to take full effect at the front; for “main force” divisions, regiments and battalions, all today predominantly North Vietnamese, are scattered over the whole landscape of three quarters of South Vietnam.

Although knocking the enemy's big units out of the fray has always been Gen. Westmoreland's first strategic aim, Hanoi's change of policy will still present problems. The big units are easier targets than small units. U.S. units will also have to learn to operate on a small scale. The more intense sapper effort predicted in the *Giap* article will make troublesome headlines, even if it does little more militarily significant damage than in the past.

But if you try to look at this major turning point through enemy eyes, you find three points standing out, all of them very bleak indeed. First, the termination of the phase of full scale big unit war means an admission of defeat after the most enormous enemy investments in the big unit.

Second, this also means quite inevitably a cruel and general intensification of the difficulties described in the COSVN document above quoted. If “fear or protracted war” was such a problem when “victory in the shortest possible time” was still being loudly promised, what will be the effect of promising nothing at all but “protracted war”?

Third, and perhaps most important, experience in many provinces has already shown that the V.C. military political base in the countryside and the V.C. control of the population depend in very large measure on the constant support of the big units. Where the big units have already been decisively seen off, control of the population has been quickly lost, and all but the hardest of the hard core of the V.C. base have tended to throw in the sponge in one way or another.

There are two ways of looking at this last matter, to be sure. Instead of two tattered, demoralized, near-demoralized divisions, the enemy commanders in Binh Dinh, Phuyen, and Khanhhoa Provinces may well be better off for a while with three or four really tough, full strength, well armed battalions. But in the end, the battalions can be made to suffer the same fate that the once proud and formidable North Vietnamese divisions have suffered. Captured documents from the V.C. provincial party committees, begging the divisions to be sent back into the populated areas, even if under strength, also show that the new policy involves immediate political risks. The outlook is very hopeful now, in truth, provided the home front does not fail the U.S. soldiers in the line at the very moment when the first great favorable turning point has seemingly been reached.

HOMESTAKE'S STRUGGLE SHOWS NEED FOR S. 49

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, while the International Monetary Fund considers a proposal to create special drawing rights, an international asset designed to supplement gold, the U.S. dollar and the pound sterling in financing trade, legislation which I have cosponsored to provide needed assistance to our domestic gold mining industry, continues to languish in the limbo of the Senate Calendar.

At this time I do not propose to debate the merits of the so-called paper gold, although I may have something to say at a later date, but I do suggest that favorable action be taken on S. 49, which

was reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on March 14 and is now on the Senate Calendar. This legislation is necessary to stimulate and encourage our gold mining industry so that it can expand to become the great source of wealth production as well as income and revenue production which it once was.

My home State of South Dakota has within its borders the fabulous Homestake Gold Mine, the largest and most successful in the United States, but which is, today, slowly declining, to the detriment of the stockholders, its large and loyal labor force, the community of Lead, and the entire State of South Dakota, all of which have benefited greatly from the output of this industry. Mr. President, I am also sure this decline is detrimental to the United States.

The September issue of the highly respected *Dun's Review* contains an excellent article on Homestake Mine, its president, J. K. Gustafson, and the valiant fight on the part of Homestake to continue to produce gold in the face of unrealistic policies of our Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

THE LAST GOLD RUSH (By Norris Willatt)

The Ulrich Goldfinger of U.S. industry is J.K. (for John Kyle) Gustafson, the mild-mannered, professional president of Homestake Mining Co., who has more gold at his fingertips than 007's greedy antagonist ever dreamed of. But unlike the flamboyant Fleming character who lusted after all the gold in Fort Knox, Homestake's Gustafson is the man most responsible for keeping the national coffers in Kentucky bulging with bullion.

How long those coffers will continue to bulge, of course, is a question that has all the economists talking to themselves and to each other these days. Never before, perhaps, has the precious yellow metal come in for so much heated discussion. Bankers, academicians and government officials debate the significance, for the U.S. and for the world, of the continued outflow of gold from America's shores. Learned papers are churned out, arguing either that gold is obsolete or that it is so essential to modern living that the price should be raised. Funditis keep bobbing up to suggest that gold's unique role be transferred to another metal or to some ersatz paper unit.

But amid the high-level give-and-take, one down-to-earth fact remains unchanged: in the eyes of the public, gold booms a magic that no other metal ever mined can match.

As the largest gold mine in the Western Hemisphere, Gustafson's Old Homestake produces one-third of the nation's output and last year recovered 806,500 ounces of gold from more than 2 million tons of ore. Dug deep into the Black Hills of South Dakota near Lead (rhymes with deed), with workings that extend for more than 200 miles, the Old Homestake has proven ore reserves of 15.26 million tons and indicated reserves of an additional 2.2 million tons. So rich is the huge, historic mine that there is little likelihood of its veins running out in the foreseeable future.

Yet to Goldfinger Gustafson, there is a clear and present danger that Homestake, pushed to the wall by soaring costs and set prices, may have to board up the old mine. “As a realist,” says Gustafson sadly, “I have

to assume that gold is not going to be revalued and that the Old Homestake mine will die.”

If that happens, it will be a black day for the Black Hills and a blow to historians and Wild West buffs alike. For the Old Homestake, which conjures up memories of Custer, the 7th Cavalry and Chief Crazy Horse, is as rich in lore as it is in lode. The mine is only a nugget's throw from Deadwood, where Wild Bill Hickok got his in the back, and barely 50 miles north of the Mount Rushmore memorial. Indeed, it was miners accompanying Custer on his 1874 expedition to quell the Sioux who first discovered the yellow metal in the Black Hills and set off the rush that led to the founding of the Homestake Mining Co. three years later.

Yet yesteryear's prospectors would be astonished to learn that today, owning a gold mine and striking it rich are not necessarily synonymous. For all its gold, Homestake last year earned only \$4.2 million, down from 1965's \$4.9 million and one of the leanest showings in the past decade. And in this year's first half, profits plunged to 56 cents a share from 84 cents a year earlier. It is a grim irony of modern gold-mining economics that a company with a ready market and a guaranteed price for its product should fare so poorly.

Still, while Homestake can rely on Uncle Sam, its sole gold customer, to snap up every ounce it can produce at a cash-on-the-barrelhead \$35 an ounce, the company is finding it increasingly difficult to make a buck from its bullion. Ten years ago there was a spread of nearly 10 cents between the cost of producing and selling Old Homestake gold, but now it has narrowed to an all but prohibitive 2.5 cents. Should that minuscule profit margin reach zero, Gustafson, who is as much a businessman as a longtime mining engineer, will shut down the Old Homestake, leaving Uncle Sam to make up the difference by increasing imports of gold from abroad.

Shoring up against that eventuality, Gustafson has shrewdly shunted Homestake into new diggings in recent years. Its uranium operations embrace mines in Utah and Wyoming, and in New Mexico in partnership (35% owned) with United Nuclear Corp. They have grown so extensive that they now overshadow gold in the company's scheme of things and last year contributed the bulk of earnings. In addition, Gustafson has spaded into lead and silver in Missouri, potash in Saskatchewan, iron ore in Australia, copper, silver, lead and zinc in Peru, and recently got into the production of brick and aggregate in California.

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE

That Homestake should be obliged to diversify is due entirely to a stifling cost-price squeeze that many another industry would consider intolerable. The price that Homestake gets for its gold is stubbornly fixed at \$35 an ounce, but its costs—especially wages, which eat up fully half of its gold revenues—have been mounting steadily. Not only is gold-mining labor highly skilled and thus highly priced, but it is also scarce, particularly in summer. “In that beautiful Black Hills country,” sighs Gustafson almost wistfully, “how're you going to keep them down in the mine after the warm weather comes?”

Then, too, gold mining defies moneysaving automation techniques that have been the salvation of the coal-mining industry, because gold, unlike coal, does not crop up in bulk but in small, often widely separated seams. Gold is, after all, where you find it, and in the Old Homestake it is found on 34 different levels from 1,700 feet below the surface to well over a mile down.

Even so, Homestake has made a number of ingenious improvements in the state of the art that have measurably increased efficiency. It has prodded productivity by means of ingenious jumbo drilling rigs and improved drills and grinders and by mech-

anizing cage transport down the shafts. In place of laboriously laying wooden floors on the various mine levels after ore has been removed by stoping. Homestake pumps back onto the floor a mixture of fill (or sand left over in the gold-extraction process), which makes a smooth floor on which men and machines can easily move about. By applying "rigorous controls" to the maintenance department alone, Gustafson proudly points out, "we've saved \$300,000 a year."

By such methods and by bypassing low-grade deposits in order to get at the higher-grade ore, the Old Homestake has pushed its annual output to more than 600,000 ounces. Recently, it even discovered a new ore body that has increased reserves by another 5 million tons and that assays as a promising \$12 per ton versus an average \$11.04 for all reserves. Although the strike is remote from existing workings and will require considerable capital investment to exploit, the first few stopes (ore removed in 10-foot slices) will probably be recovered by year's end, thereby raising slightly the average grade of mined ore.

But these developments do not by themselves assure the Old Homestake's survival. To aid the beleaguered gold miners, both the House and the Senate have bills pending that would subsidize gold mining. However, such legislation, as it now reads, would be aimed at encouraging new mines. President Gustafson maintained that the best way for Washington to assure its source of supply—from Homestake at least—would be to revalue gold to a price that would make the mining of it a viable business.

Being a "realist," he also knows that the Treasury Department is adamantly opposed to such a drastic measure and instead is talking about removing the gold backing from the dollar in favor of "paper gold," a new unit of international currency that would be backed entirely by the economic power and prestige of the U.S. "Of course, I'm prejudiced," Gustafson allows, "but if the U.S. decided to refuse to redeem dollars in gold, that would seem to me a very embarrassing and humiliating development."

Nevertheless, Homestake, with a small stake in silver, can find encouragement in the recent action of the Treasury Department in abandoning its subsidy of silver at \$1.29 an ounce. Having minted sufficient silverless coins to meet the needs of the economy, Treasury set silver free from its long-sheltered price and promptly saw it shoot up 30% to \$1.77½ an ounce on the open market. As producers of everything from sterling silverware to photographic film and dental fillings pondered their list prices, most observers felt that silver's price would level off at around \$1.50 to \$1.60 an ounce.

But from the time he became Homestake Mining's head man in 1961, J. K. Gustafson, a mining geologist who spent years "rocketing around the world" on various geological expeditions, has gone on the assumption that he must one day give the shaft to the Old Homestake mine. With uranium looming large, he considers that Homestake is well fixed for the future.

A HIGHLY PROFITABLE ACTIVITY

A highly profitable activity, uranium brought in about \$3 million of Homestake's \$4.2-million net income last year. In the near future, though, Homestake's uranium expectations may not be as great. Under a contract with the Atomic Energy Commission, the price that Homestake and its partner, United Nuclear Corp., will receive for their ore is scheduled to decline from the current \$8 a pound to \$6.70 in 1969. And by 1970, Homestake's interest in the partnership is slated to shrink from 35% to 25%. But the AEC has announced its intention of turning the marketing of uranium over to private industry after 1969, and the prospects, considering that half of all the new generating capacity ordered in the U.S. last

year was atomic, are pleasing to all uranium miners.

In fact, Homestake has exhibited a golden touch in most of its worldwide mining ventures. Together with American Metal Climax, it is building the first new lead smelter in the U.S. in forty years. Believes Gustafson: "We can produce lead as cheaply as anyone in the world."

In Saskatchewan, where Homestake shares a potash mine with U.S. Borax and Chemical, the first profits should begin coming in by 1969. And in western Australia, the iron ore it is mining with Hanna Mining and local interests has already been contracted for by ten Japanese steel mills over a seven-year period.

"For a company our size, we've undertaken a very large exploration effort," says Gustafson. "We can do it because we're in good shape financially and because we've developed a fine organization and staff. Also, we've chosen some top-grade partners to share the costs and risks. They tend to be market-oriented and so provide us with an expertise that Homestake, as a 'captive' gold miner, lacks."

Of course, it still could happen that Washington, from conviction or pressure, might revalue the price of gold after all. If and when that golden day dawns, the Old Homestake will really hit pay dirt.

THEODORE SORESENSEN ON VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful and closely informed Americans is the brilliant former White House counsel to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, Theodore C. Sorensen. In a carefully restrained and well-reasoned article, published in the Saturday Review of October 21, 1967, Mr. Sorensen presents the case for curbing and hopefully ending the war in Vietnam.

Those who enjoy the silly process of labeling everyone who speaks out on Vietnam as either "hawk" or "dove" will be frustrated by Mr. Sorensen. It is not easy to fix such a superficial label upon a man who seeks only to apply the light of reason and the cool test of national interest and international responsibility to this complex issue.

I commend this objective, thoroughly constructive article to my colleagues of the Congress, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM: HOW WE CAN END IT (By Theodore C. Sorensen)

I have not previously spoken out publicly against our course in Vietnam. My years in the White House made me more conscious than most private citizens of the burdens our President bears, more aware of his unique access to information, and more unwilling to add fuel to the fires of dissension within my party and country. But I believe that the President's friends and supporters today can best serve him as well as the country by speaking out: Not by offering oversimplified solutions or personal criticisms; not by questioning anyone's motives or credibility; not by reflecting on the skill and courage of our fighting forces; but by helping to seek before it is too late a reasonable, feasible course in Vietnam that offers some hope of achieving an early peaceful settlement—a course with costs and risks more proportionate to America's interests than this present avenue of expanding escalation and slaughter.

"Your government should understand," a

Russian diplomat said to me as we lunched last August in Moscow, "that we are obligated to do for the North Vietnamese whatever they ask us to do. If they ask us to send bombers, we will send bombers. If they ask us to send men, we will send men." This was not delivered as a threat nor was it surprisingly new. But it helped point up for me the urgency of our stopping World War III now before it starts.

I realize that it is difficult for a great power to alter its course—but the Soviet Union pulled its missiles out of Cuba (and received world praise for doing so). I realize that it is difficult for our proud nation to acknowledge error instead of compounding it—but we did exactly that at the Bay of Pigs.

I do not say that we have wholly erred in Vietnam or that we should precipitously pull out our troops. Nor am I concerned here with many of the other disputes surrounding that war. The Senate will long debate the legal basis for our involvement, the alleged choices between Europe and Asia, and the effect of the war on our prestige, politics, and priorities. Historians will long debate over how and why we got into Vietnam, who first breached the Geneva Agreement, whether it was originally a civil war, whether another President would have acted differently, whether Congress was consulted adequately, and whether the various past precedents cited—from Munich to Malaya—are meaningful. What concerns me now is not the past but the future.

What concerns me now is the prospect of an endless war in which the original issues (to say nothing of the Vietnamese people) will have long been forgotten, in which each gradation of American escalation will continue to be offset by more troops from the North and less help from the South. What concerns me is the prospect of a frustrated, aggravated, bitterly divided America, irritated at its increasing isolation from the world, unable to accept its inability to bring this upstart to heel, under growing pressure from a growing military establishment, consequently pouring in more men, bombing out more targets, and finally, in desperation, mining or blockading the Haiphong harbor or even invading the North by means of a permanent excursion across the demilitarized zone or an "Inchon-type" landing behind that front line. Then the entry of Chinese and possibly Russian "volunteers" will be a very real threat and possibly—even without our destroying North Vietnamese dikes, bombing MIG bases in China, or occupying Hanoi—an inevitable fact, as inevitable as the fact that their entry will lead eventually to a world-wide nuclear war. The tragic irony of it is that all this could happen without our advancing one single step nearer to our original goal of a terror-free South Vietnam.

We have already moved in recent years from limited counterinsurgency to all-out combat, from 15,000 advisers to 500,000 troops, from a war fought largely by South Vietnamese forces in the South to a war fought largely by American forces both North and South. Each stage of escalation has brought a response from the other side requiring more escalation, bringing a further response from the other side requiring still more escalation. When two doses of penicillin failed to help the patient, we gave him four, then six, now eight. It is high time we realized that penicillin is not what this patient needs, and more can only poison him.

To be sure, we cannot now lose the war. We have prevented the kind of large-scale North Vietnamese assaults that might have destroyed all hope for self-determination and survival in the South. There is no prospect now that the Communists can push our forces into the sea or impose their rules by conquest. Nor is there any prospect now that we will abandon to slaughter those South Vietnamese who stood up against a Communist military takeover. But this

country has to face the unaccustomed and uncomfortable fact that, despite all the brilliance and valor of our fighting forces, their lives are being given for a war which—in terms of achieving our total objectives, political and moral as well as military, in all Asia as well as Vietnam—we are not “winning” in the traditional sense and cannot ever expect to “win.”

We are not “containing” the Red Chinese when we create a vacuum on their borders into which they will inexorably move unless we stay forever—when we increase North Vietnam's dependence on Chinese imports—or when we erode South Vietnam's institutions, traditions, economy, independence, and spirit.

We are not “winning the war for men's minds” among the South Vietnamese people, much less “pacifying” their country, when we level their villages, burn their crops, dominate and prolong their war, work primarily with the privileged few entrenched in both military and government, and place half a million free-spending Americans into that tiny, impoverished, and now inflation-ridden country.

We are not demonstrating the futility of Communist “wars of liberation” to an army that soon returns to rule by night those areas from which we have temporarily driven it; nor are we deterring similar attacks in Thailand or elsewhere when we stretch our forces thin in Vietnam.

We are not “defending our national interest” when we endlessly divert more than two billion tax dollars a month away from our cities and schools and overseas friends for a war that, much as we dislike the word, is producing at best only a stalemate.

I read all the predictions that victory is just around the escalation corner—but I heard those same predictions three and four and even five years ago. I read all the rosy statistics on how many Communists we have killed and captured and induced to defect—but still their number keeps growing. I read all the claims on our bombing successes in the North—but still the infiltration southward continues. I read all the statements that this is a joint effort with South Vietnam and others—but still we are doing more and more of the fighting and dying. And, finally, I read all the assurances that neither the Russians nor the Chinese will intervene—but at the same time Washington experts acknowledge that neither Peking nor Moscow could tolerate a North Vietnamese defeat.

General Westmoreland calls it a war of attrition. That it is—a war of attrition pitting American youth on the Asian mainland against an Asian foe which has not yet begun to tap its immense manpower reserves. Most of the time that foe is a Vietnamese guerrilla—a tough, cunning, elusive warrior who knows every hiding place in his native land, who is fed and shielded by the people we are supposedly there to defend, and who believes that someday his children will push out the Americans just as his elders pushed out the French.

Even if the old-fashioned kind of military victory in Vietnam were possible, it would require an indefinite occupation of that country by American troops under constant attack from such guerrillas. But such a victory is not possible against an enemy that keeps coming and fighting, as it has for twenty years and as it seemingly can for twenty more, suffering heavy casualties but also inflicting them, hiding in the hills or brush, disappearing literally underground or by mingling with civilians, eluding our “search and destroy” missions and then returning, controlling or terrorizing virtually as many villages and roads, and assassinating or kidnapping virtually as many South Vietnamese local leaders, as it did before we arrived.

If countering this kind of guerrilla warfare requires, as the Pentagon has said, that our

forces outnumber theirs by a lopsided ratio of 3 or 4 or even 10 to 1—and if, in addition, we must take over the immense and unfamiliar task of non-military “pacification,” and do it without a nonpartisan civil service, without the goodwill of the people, without effective land distribution or respect for the South Vietnamese troops or cooperation from their intellectuals—then where do we obtain the manpower to offset the gradual tapping of Communist reserves? Not from our Asian and Pacific allies who have, on the whole, shown very little enthusiasm for proping up with their own forces what we have warned could be the first of the falling dominoes. Nor are there unlimited reserves still available to the South Vietnamese army, whose brave but poorly paid and dispirited soldiers are still too often led by corrupt and politically controlled officers more imitative of the Vietcong in brutally interrogating civilians and prisoners than in risking their own comfort in combat.

It is small wonder, then, that one American military leader has said that 2,000,000 U.S. troops will be required to root out the terrorists in the South, village by village. But if the other side keeps growing through recruitment and reinfiltration, despite escalated bombings and electronic barriers, even 2,000,000 may not be enough. And what would an American commitment of 2,000,000 men do to our force levels at home and around the world? What, finally, would it do to the South Vietnamese themselves?

“In the final analysis,” said President Kennedy in the fall of 1963, “it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it . . . the people of Vietnam.” But as we pour in more troops, destroying in the process their economic stability more effectively than the Communists have ever done, it has become our war. We have the largest fighting force. We suffer the largest fatalities. The South Vietnamese people, weary after twenty years of warriors and foreigners, divided by rival sects and provincial politics, seem simultaneously to resent and prefer our taking over their battle. Many of the young leaders and scholars upon whom the country's liberation must ultimately depend are reported openly cynical and skeptical of the American presence. The present military government with which we are identified—now popularly elected but still far from universally accepted—seems incapable of understanding any real opposition or dissent, and incapable of undertaking any serious land reforms or serious peace negotiations.

A more viable, representative, and reform-minded civilian government, possessing real strength in the grassroots as well as the cities, rallying the people after the fashion of the Philippines' Magsaysay, and offering true amnesty and amity to the Vietcong and true reconciliation to the North Vietnamese, might have at least been able to increase the rate of Communist defectors to a level exceeding South Vietnamese desertions. That has not happened, nor will it. But the strength, the morale, and the legitimacy of the present government in Saigon are at least sufficient now to permit our own country to pursue a different course.

I wrote in my book *Kennedy* that that Administration's objective in Vietnam was to gain time—time for the South Vietnamese, with our help and protection, to achieve a society sufficiently cohesive both politically and militarily to negotiate a balanced settlement. There is no reason now for us to refrain from concluding that such time is finally near at hand. The South Vietnamese have expressed through their elections a longing for peace and the beginning of constitutional rule. The Communists have reason to know that they cannot win a final military victory. The Red Chinese, beset by internal strife and external setbacks, may be less able to interfere with negotiations. The Soviets prefer peace to a widening war. The

National Liberation Front has dropped its resistance to the inclusion of other South Vietnamese in a postwar government; and the North Vietnamese, at least in the view of some, may again be indicating a genuine willingness to talk peace.

Their willingness, to be sure, has been conditioned upon our suspending indefinitely and unconditionally the bombing of the North. If that bombing had been clearly curtailing Communist infiltration and operations within the South, one could more readily accept our refusal on the ground that such attacks were a more effective way of saving American lives than attempting to interdict North Vietnamese lines in the South. But in fact, despite our constant expansion of targets to include all those of genuine military importance, Secretary of Defense McNamara has acknowledged that the infiltration of North Vietnamese forces has continued to grow—infiltrating over countless routes, by boat and truck and bicycle and foot, under cover of jungle or darkness. In the South they live off the land whenever their supply trains are delayed. In the North, they obtain replacements overland through China whenever their supply depots are destroyed. On balance, the continued bombing, by increasing an embittered militancy in the North and thus prolonging the war, appears to be costing more American lives in the long run than it actually saves.

Heavy bombing has never been wholly decisive in any war. No one promised that it would be in this one. But let us leave aside the various inconsistencies in the various statements explaining our original reasons for bombing. The overwhelming weight of the evidence still fails to indicate that pounding that largely primitive, peasant economy with more bombs than we unloaded on all of Europe in World War II has brought us a single day closer to the hour of peaceful settlement. The overwhelming weight of the evidence still fails to indicate that the North Vietnamese resolve to resist has been weakened instead of hardened by these massive attacks on their homeland. The overwhelming weight of the evidence still fails to indicate that any feasible amount of bombing can ever prevent the North Vietnamese from infiltrating into the South all the men, arms, and food needed to sustain a low-level guerrilla war indefinitely.

To be sure, the bombing is not without effect. It not only boosts the morale of the Saigon government—a somewhat dubious justification—but punishes and pressures and pains the North Vietnamese. It makes their maintenance of reserves and supply lines, and particularly their transportation of large cadres and heavy artillery pieces, more difficult and more costly. It makes life harder and poorer for their citizens and their soldiers. But their life has always been hard and poor. They have never depended on cities or industries. They have known very little but war against the Japanese, the French, and the Americans during most of their lives. A still lower standard of living now, an inconvenient mobilization of manpower to repair bridges and railroads, an increase in shortages and terrors and casualties, do not add up to grounds for surrender, now that they have endured this much this long and have so little to lose but their lives.

There seems little to be gained, then, by our insisting upon a continuance of the bombing in the North. Suspending it will not produce a Communist military victory in the South, nor will it bring the collapse of any Saigon government worthy of our attention. But suspending it will, possibly with the aid of the new electronic “fence,” confine the war to the South, where it must be won anyway. It will end the strain on U.S. aircraft crews badly needed for air support in the South, while reducing the costly loss of our aircraft and the humiliation of our cap-

tured pilots. It will limit the area our dollars must surely rebuild when the war is over. It will end the toll of North Vietnamese civilian casualties which embarrassingly but unavoidably grows as the list of our targets is expanded. And it will eliminate the single largest barrier to world support for our position and the single largest barrier to negotiations with Hanoi.

Bombing, we have now learned, cannot force negotiations but it may well be preventing them. There is no possibility of the North Vietnamese engaging in talks while their homeland is being bombed. Inasmuch as the bombing can no longer be regarded as an indispensable means of securing our forces and objectives in the South, the time has come for us to suspend indefinitely and unconditionally our bombing of the North in order to test Hanoi's sincerity and see how it will reciprocate.

Accompanying such a suspension with conditions and deadlines will not work. The North Vietnamese will not respond to an ultimatum. Nor will they respond to our demand or even "expectation" that in exchange they stop sending men and supplies to South Vietnam—in effect stop fighting the war altogether—while we continue to fight. Naturally, no American is going to like it if and when the North's flow of troops and supplies to the South increases during such a suspension. We did not like it when fighting continued in Korea during the truce talks; but had we refused to talk, the loss of American lives there would surely have been higher. Today we must face the facts that prolonging the bombing cannot end the war or even the infiltration and that this impasse is costing us more lives than the bombing saves. Let us also face the fact that someday we will stop it—and the longer we put it off, the more difficult it will be for both sides to negotiate a reasonable settlement.

Indeed, there is already a danger that we have passed the point of no return beyond which neither the Hanoi regime nor the Administration in Washington could reach an accommodation with the other without the risk of being turned out of office. Bitterness and distrust are rapidly rising in both camps. Militants and military chiefs are gaining influence in both capitals. Each side is fearful that a cease-fire will cause a loss of momentum and morale, that negotiations will be only a cover for reinforcements. Each side believes that the other should pay the price of aggression, accept the blame, and make the first concession. Each side would prefer to postpone negotiations until he is clearly winning (at which time, of course, the other side would not negotiate).

Perhaps even now the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front are not interested in serious negotiations. Their recent public statements about peace talks have been largely bellicose, rude, and inconsistent. They appear convinced of their ability to outlast us, meanwhile bleeding us white. They do not wish to offend their largest neighbor, protector, and potential supplier, Red China, which would obviously prefer to see us hopelessly bogged down in Vietnam without risking one Chinese casualty, and which might well threaten the North Vietnamese with a disastrous interruption of supplies if they even talk with the Americans. The pro-Chinese faction in the Hanoi government is already said by some to be on the ascendancy.

But even if Hanoi is not now ready to negotiate, we can—instead of continuing the present treadmill into ever more dangerous, divisive, and self-destructive escalation—prudently de-escalate our war effort without harming our interests and with some hope that Hanoi will de-escalate also. Limiting our military commitments, objectives, investment, and assaults, meanwhile consolidating our position in the most populous areas of the South, would cost us fewer lives, less

money, no territory, and no "face," while better enabling us to wait until outside events—such as divisions in the Communist camp—making negotiations more possible. Certainly our present course is not dividing the Vietcong from Hanoi or Hanoi from Peking, and indeed may end up helping to unite China for Mao or even Peking with Moscow.

But in fact we do not know with any certainty whether Hanoi and the Vietcong—together or separately—are now ready to negotiate. We have not stopped the bombing indefinitely to find out. We have not since one thirty-seven-day pause nearly two years ago accompanied our talk of negotiations with real deeds of de-escalation demonstrating our earnest good faith. We have not given to the pursuit of peace the same effort, ingenuity, and relentless consistency we have given to prosecuting the war. We have not prevented the Saigon regime from torpedoing the rise of civilian neutralist forces in the South capable of negotiating with the North and the National Liberation Front. We have not left those voices in Hanoi who might once have been concerned about their economy with much reason now to justify a cease-fire. We have not, to the best of my knowledge, adopted a concrete, mutually acceptable plan for negotiations—as distinguished from admirable but vague statements of principle—and communicated that plan to the North. Publicly, at least, we have not offered any of the concessions and compromises required by the military and practical situation for a realistic settlement, frequently implying instead only that we stand ready to negotiate the surrender of the Vietcong.

Most serious of all, we have not been sufficiently forthright or forthcoming in response to what may have been actual opportunities to start or explore negotiations. Perhaps we were looking for a different kind of "signal" and missed the one they sent. Perhaps we were plagued by poor translations, poor communications, or poor coordination on both sides. But whatever the reasons and whoever sons and whoever is to blame—and assessing it now will not help—we must in the future take more care not to spurn or ignore potential opportunities for negotiation, much less deny their existence or escalate in response to them.

Such a posture would involve no weakening of our resolve or responsibility. President Johnson has called "the path of peaceful settlement . . . the only path for reasonable men." President Kennedy obtained withdrawal of the Soviet missiles from Cuba by giving attention to the olive branch as well as the arrows—by adopting a carefully measured combination of defense, diplomacy, and dialogue. Perhaps his ploy in that crisis of interpreting a Communist demand in his own terms, his response thus necessitating their reply, could be used now to initiate negotiations with Hanoi. Perhaps the good offices of U Thant, a resolution by the U.N. General Assembly, or a reconvening of the Geneva Conference could initiate talks without either side worrying about protocol or precedent. Perhaps we could invite the other side to the President's next summit meeting with our Asian allies. It would be more realistic, in my view, to seek a secret conference, with no mediator, arbitrator, or press releases, thus alleviating potential Chinese and other pressures. But the essential step is to bring together the combatants—and that necessarily means all the combatants, including the Vietcong.

Such talks are not doomed to end in disagreement and disappointment. After all, both sides are pledged to work:

First, for a return to the Geneva Agreement of 1954;

Second, for an end to hostilities and the withdrawal of all foreign troops and bases;

Third, for a neutral, peaceful, independent South Vietnam, free to determine in new

elections its own political, economic, and social system, and its relationship or reunification with the North;

Fourth, for a government—if necessary (though neither Saigon nor the NLF has squarely faced this), a coalition government composed of all parties, as in the Laotian settlement of 1962—acting on behalf of all South Vietnamese citizens in accordance with the principles of universal suffrage, free speech, free worship, and meaningful land redistribution.

Agreement on the interpretation and implementation of these principles will not be reached quickly or easily. Such words as "freedom," "independence," and "neutrality" mean very different things to the two sides. Some form of international guarantees and supervision will be essential at least at the outset. But agreement should not be impossible.

Such an ending, while restoring South Vietnamese self-determination and preventing its conquest, would not leave the United States and its allies with any better position militarily than they had before the war began—but neither did the ending of the Cuban crisis or the Berlin crisis or even the Korean war. Such a settlement would also involve grave risks. It would endure only if both sides felt as a matter of practical self-interest that this kind of peace was preferable to war. Even then there would be no way of assuring the American people of the elimination of terrorists from the South, of the early departure of all American troops from Asia, or of the nonparticipation in the South Vietnamese government of one variety or another of Communists. Indeed, there is no negotiated solution possible that would not lend itself to bitter attacks in the Congress and pose continuing dangers for the future.

Thus, whatever quantities of national courage, understanding, and unity are required on our part today to fight and accept the war in Vietnam, they will be needed in twice those amounts to find and accept the peace. But find it we must. While we cannot overlook any dangers, neither can we overlook any opportunities. A new opportunity may now be approaching in the holiday season. We have been able to arrange in recent years a Christmas cease-fire in Vietnam. If we plan and work for it now, we can be prepared this Christmas to have the firing cease forever.

PIONEER ST. LOUIS DETOXIFICATION CENTER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, one out of every three arrests in the United States in 1965 was for public drunkenness. That fact was underscored by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

The Commission found that handling drunkenness within the system of criminal justice burdens and distorts its operation and appears ineffective in deterring drunkenness and in meeting the problem of the chronic alcoholic offender. As an alternate approach and as a prerequisite to taking drunkenness out of the criminal system, the Commission recommended the establishment of civil detoxification centers.

For some 10 months, a pioneer detoxification center has been in operation in St. Louis. It is the first detoxification program in North America to systematically remove chronic alcoholics from the jails and place them in detoxification centers. The St. Louis program has been undertaken by the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department in cooperation with

the Sisters of St. Mary's and the Social Science Institute of Washington University.

From the standpoint of reducing the workload of the police, the courts, and the correctional system, and also in treating the offender, preliminary reports on the St. Louis experiment are positive.

The United States has the second highest rate of alcoholism in the world. Because this problem is national in scope and the St. Louis project is of wide interest, I ask unanimous consent that an article on the subject, published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of October 3, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the Article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETOX CENTER HELPING PUBLIC DRUNKS: OUT OF THE REVOLVING DOOR
(By Marguerite Shepard)

People who chronically get drunk on the street in St. Louis are no longer caught in "the revolving door"—thanks to the pioneering Detoxification Center here.

"The revolving door" refers to the process where the public drunk is arrested, jailed, released—then re-arrested, jailed and released, and on and on, because punishment does not stop alcoholics from drinking.

A preliminary report on results of the Detox Center, sponsored by the St. Louis Police Department and operated in St. Mary's Infirmary, was given last week in Chicago to the annual meeting of the North American Association of Alcoholism Programs.

A pioneering project, first in the Western Hemisphere, and only one in the world sponsored by a police department, the center already has a wide reputation, spread by experts from 30 states and several foreign countries who have come here to see it.

But the proof of the pudding is in the eating: Does the Detox Center really do any good?

A study following up a sample 100 Detox Center patients on an average of four months after their release shows that the answer is unequivocally "Yes."

James M. Weber, St. Louis Police patrolman on leave the past year to get his master's degree in sociology at Washington University—on a police scholarship, first of its kind—made the study, under the direction of Dr. David J. Pittman, university Social Science Institute director.

(Dr. Pittman, author of a number of books on alcoholism, and consultant to the St. Louis Police Department, has been president of the NAAAP for the past two years. It was he who coined the "revolving door" phrase to describe the ineffectiveness of traditional methods of treating public drunks.)

Mr. Weber's study found:

Of his sample of 100, 51 had markedly improved in their drinking patterns—and 21 of those had been "dry" since getting out of the Detox center.

Fifty-six were still in markedly better health.

Twenty-five had much better job records, 16 had considerably more income and 14 were living in much better homes (many had had no home but the flophouse or street).

The center opened last Nov. 16. The study goes up to last July 1. In that time 548 patients were handled—most staying the prescribed seven days.

And although police take public drunks to the center only if they are arrested in three certain police districts—the three with the biggest problem with drunks—Mr. Weber found that city-wide arrests for drunkenness offenses were 60 per cent less after the center

went into operation—compared to the comparable time a year earlier.

Some of the center's patients were picked up drunk again but the re-admission rate was only 24 per cent, low in view of the fact that alcoholism is a chronic disease, Mr. Weber pointed out.

Of the sampling of 100, only 24 had, before their time in the Detox Center, been able to function with any degree of normalcy. After their time in the center, 51 were able to do so.

For half of the alcoholics, the center represented the first medical treatment they had ever received for alcoholism.

For almost all of them, the care at the center was the first sign in a long time that "somebody cared about me."

Said Mr. Weber: "The mere fact that a 1-day program of nutrition, sanitation and mental hygiene would leave its effects on such large numbers of these individuals three months after the treatment period is evidence of the accomplishments which can be made with this group of 'hopeless people.'"

Impact of the program upon police officers was also strong.

Many openly skeptical at the beginning wound up enthusiastic fans. Some even went so far as to volunteer services off duty; some donated clothing and other useful articles to the center.

But the clincher was when Mr. Weber and his co-investigators discovered "informal shuttling procedures being conducted so that an individual would be found in one of the districts served by the center."

That is, if an officer found a drunk in the wrong district, he moved him over—so he could get to the center!

St. Louis had more than its share of alcoholism authorities talking at the Chicago convention last week of the North American Association of Alcoholism Projects.

The St. Louis Detoxification Center was subject of most of their talks.

Following are some of the highlights of their talks:

Col. Edward L. Dowd, president of the St. Louis Board of Police Commissioners:

"Budgetary savings of more than \$100,000 are anticipated by affected city agencies in the first six months of the Detoxification Center's operation, in both man-hours and physical resources saved."

"Workload of the police, courts and correctional systems has all dropped. The city workhouse has had a 50 per cent drop in the number of people they would normally receive for being drunk on the streets."

"On the basis of our experience in St. Louis, I would strongly recommend that immediate steps be taken in every urban center to implement such a program."

Miss Laura Root, research associate at Washington U.'s Social Science Institute, and Detox Center consultant:

"A substantial core of negative sentiment still exists toward the alcoholic on the part of many hospital personnel . . . a primary diagnosis of alcoholism is not accepted in at least 40 per cent of the hospitals. This negative attitude can be seen in many communities throughout the U.S., where public alcoholics have been either rejected and/or jailed rather than treated."

"Impact of the Easter and Driver decisions (federal appellate court decisions holding that people cannot be confined for drunkenness unless given treatment) has been phenomenal. Most communities are overwhelmed with a concern as to what should be done and how."

Dr. Joseph B. Kendis, medical director of the Detox Center:

"Despite the fact we are getting probably the sickest alcoholics we have ever seen, we have not yet seen a single case of delirium tremens. We feel this is due to the medication given promptly (including vitamin therapy), the food started promptly and the

tender loving care given by our nursing staff . . .

"Our group therapy is the variety known as 'reality therapy,' where, instead of digging into the patient's past, we attempt to have them take a realistic view of themselves and assess their responsibilities as they are, with the idea of building a better future . . .

"Do not berate the alcoholic, do not use as a basis of your discussions with him what will happen if he does not stop drinking. He already knows this, and fear will be only a temporary deterrent to drinking."

"Instead, use the positive approach, showing your approval when he is doing well and pointing out what can be gained through sobriety. This will give him something to hang on to and make his efforts seem more worthwhile."

Dr. David J. Pittman, NAAAP president and Washington University Social Science Institute director.

"The U.S. remains one of the few countries in the western world without a national program of alcoholism control."

"Federal expenditures for alcoholism control are still miserly—despite the fact that more than one-third of the arrests in this country are for public intoxication and despite the fact that hundreds of Americans die needlessly in jail cells from the effects of chronic alcoholism."

"Passage by the Congress of Senate Bill 1508—the Javits-Moss Alcoholism Care and Control Bill—would help solve the alcoholism problem. It would provide Detox Centers under medical supervision, treatment centers for patients under court order and for alcoholics in jail or correctional institutions and after-care programs."

Dr. Ronald J. Catanzaro, deputy director of the Missouri State Division of Mental Diseases in charge of alcoholism control, also spoke in Chicago:

"Intensive special alcoholism centers throughout the country report approximately one-third of their patients are rehabilitated after a period of intensive inpatient therapy, one-third are helped significantly and one-third are not helped appreciably."

ANTELOPE ISLAND IN GREAT SALT LAKE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on October 6 the National Parks Advisory Board was in Salt Lake City and visited Antelope Island, which has been proposed as a national monument in a bill which passed the Senate on July 13. I am sure that the members of the Board were thrilled with the opportunity of visiting this unique primitive island, set in the Great Salt Lake, which is the Western Hemisphere's dead sea.

A few days ago, Mr. Murray Moler, associate editor of the Standard-Examiner, of Ogden, wrote a column about Antelope Island which is very descriptive and, in my opinion, should be printed in the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Moler's column appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTELOPE ISLAND.—From the shoreline where most of Utah's metropolitan residents live, Antelope Island looks like a huge abandoned ship out in Great Salt Lake.

The mountainsides of the big island seem bare—when Antelope's viewed from a distance. There's no evidence of human—or animal—life. Only a few birds, mostly seagulls, would appear to prefer to call Antelope Island their home.

So why should the island be so important that it would be ticketed for development of its north end by the State of Utah as a recreational center? And is there anything about Antelope Island to justify introduction of a bill in Congress that would set the entire island aside as a national monument?

It takes a trip to the island to answer both of these questions. Not just a flight over. Not just a quick stop by boat at one of the many beaches. But a day-long visit and a personal inspection.

For the average Utahian, this is out of the question since the entire island is privately owned—as it has been for nearly a century. The one unbroken connection with the mainland—until the presently uncompleted road from Syracuse is finished—is a rough causeway off Antelope's southeastern side, a causeway well blocked now by a locked gate.

We went through that gate Saturday, upon invitation of the Island Ranching Co., the island's owners, and spent more than eight hours bumping over its primitive roads in a Jeep or wandering around its trails in company of about 20 other interested men and women.

It was an eye-opening trip!

The causeway leads from the mud and salt flats west of the Salt Lake Airport across reliction lands left dry by the lowering of the lake's level. It was raining when we crossed—and driving had to be carefully accomplished to avoid sliding into the bogs.

The initial surprise came at the size of the ranching operation already being conducted on Antelope by its owners. There are fenced fields where cattle graze in the summer, supplementing the forage they find on the open ranges on other sections of the island. Dry farm crops, including wheat, are also raised.

The Sorensens, a middle-age couple, live the year-round at a trim, clean but old—its walls are mostly adobe brick—farm home in about the middle of the east side of the island. A spring just below the house has pleasantly fresh and cold water. Other springs on the mountainside provide both culinary water and a nominal amount of irrigation for a few portions of cultivated land.

The Sorensens keep in touch with the mainland by mobile radiophone, plus frequent drives to downtown Salt Lake City—an hour's jaunt, in good weather.

Their biggest worry is about fire. Obviously, there's no fire department on Antelope. So extinguishers dot the walls of the farmhouse and the barns. And a careful patrol is kept to prevent stray visitors from carelessly starting a blaze that would quickly sweep through the tilled fields and into the cheatgrass that predominates on the slopes of much of the island.

Just north of the farm, still on the east side there's one field where the featured resident is an old buffalo—one of the island's herd whose population is estimated at 45 to 50. There are no antelope on Antelope Island anymore, incidentally, although there were on days gone by.

This buffalo bull—like another bull who paws around his own lone tree on the other side of the island—is an outcast. In the primitive social system of the buffalo, he became obsolete—his place with the cows and the calves taken over by a younger, more vigorous bull. So he now wanders by himself near the island road, close to feed and close to fresh water.

When our Jeep station wagon came by, leading the seven-vehicle expedition, he looked our way longingly as though he was lonesome. Then he shook his massive head, pawed at the ground with his amazingly short front legs, and took off up the mountain, loping at a fast—but awkward—pace.

There were birds everywhere. Not just the gulls that can be seen from the mainland but birds of many species—tiny and melodious meadowlarks, colorfully-plumed Chinese

pheasants and recently-planted chukar partridges, to name a few.

This late in the year the only flowers visible in any quantity were sunflowers. But they, undisturbed, had grown to tremendous size in the fields. The Jeep bumpers kept grabbing bundles of them as we drove along.

At the north end of the island we stood on a hill and looked back toward the Wasatch Mountains—dark under the shadows of towering rainclouds but dotted with patches of bright fall leaves.

The cities of Davis, Weber and south Box Elder counties could be seen at the base of the mountains, looking almost tiny in the distance. It's a different view!

The 1967 Utah Legislature has authorized the Great Salt Lake Authority to go ahead with development of nearly 2,000 acres of the island, to be purchased under a long-term agreement. Should Sen. Frank E. Moss' National Monument proposal go through, the entire island would eventually become a recreation facility—with the state's soon-to-be developed beach facility blended into the overall plan.

Whiterock Beach on Crescent Cove, beside Elephant Point and next door to Bridger Bay, would be the center of the state park. It's a beautiful beach, with white sand and a sloping approach to the unique waters of Great Salt Lake.

The buffalo roam mostly in that same area and they could be seen frequently, usually in groups of 10 to 14, moving from the grass of the open spaces to the shelter of the trees that have escaped early-day logging and the ever-present fires.

At one high spot, a former airways beacon building marks the area where an observation point could be developed that would give a spectacular view of the mountains and cities to the east and to the ocean-like lake and the salt flats to the west.

Down the rarely-seen west side of the island, there are many unexpected attractions.

In one broad valley, where a camp grounds could be located, there are troughs of fresh, spring-fed water for the animals. Nearby are the remains of shafts sunk many years ago by prospectors hunting for minerals.

Erosion and chemical action has cut into one shore-located rock formation until it resembles a dead forest of old, bent, twisted trees. Pock marks—like swallow's nests—dot the rocks. We temporarily dubbed it "Pothole Goblin Point."

High on one peak, Weber State College and other schools are working on a cave, digging to determine if traces of Indian life can be located.

On the southwest side, there are beaches that could also be developed for swimming—some day.

The Antelope Island story wouldn't be complete without mention of its most conspicuous residents: The mosquitos. They are present by the millions. Hungry, too. They will have to be controlled as one of the first steps toward ending the ancient isolation of the island.

CLARIFICATION OF POSITION OF SENATOR CASE ON WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, I recently placed in the RECORD an editorial by a nationally known writer, which took issue with several distinguished Senators on the war in Vietnam. I wish to clarify the reasons that motivated me when I placed that editorial in the RECORD.

My basic position on the war generally favors the necessary course we are pursuing. Because some elements of that editorial delineated my feelings rather well, I placed it in the RECORD to illus-

trate the strength of that position. The last thing in my mind was to give offense to or strike out at any Member of this body.

I have never and will never demean our role in the legislative life of the land by attacking a fellow Senator.

In this case, because I am concerned with, and in favor of, the press' accurate reporting of the position of a U.S. Senator, no matter to which party he belongs, I shall place in the RECORD a clarifying letter. It was written by my esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. In the interests of accurate reporting and clarification of my earlier insertion, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CASE's letter to the writer involved be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., October 12, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, Jr.,
Editor in Chief, Hearst Newspapers,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. HEARST: Your editorial of October 1, entitled "War and Politics," has been called to my attention, and I must take issue with your misstatement of my position.

It has always been my position that I support our objectives in Vietnam, while reserving my right to criticize failure in seeking those objectives. And as the enclosed texts of my statements will show, it has become evident to me that the Administration is failing in the basic objective of nation-building in South Vietnam.

I have not "reversed my position," nor have I joined Senator Morton "in deploring continuation of the Vietnam struggle" and in calling "for a halt to our bombing as a first step toward eventual peace talks with the enemy."

I have stated that the bombing of North Vietnam should be limited to those targets with a significant impact on the infiltration of men and supplies into South Vietnam. But it has long been my view that prospects for meaningful negotiations do not hinge on the cessation of bombing, but rather on evidence of real progress toward our objectives in South Vietnam. And that is precisely why I have not joined those of my colleagues who see a link between a bombing suspension and negotiations.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator.

NOMINATION OF ERWIN N. GRISWOLD TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the presidential appointment of Erwin N. Griswold to become the Nation's new Solicitor General has been widely hailed as an outstanding choice. It is gratifying to note the excellent response reflected in editorial comment around the country when the dean of the Harvard Law School was selected for this high post.

I ask unanimous consent that three editorials be printed in the RECORD. They are from the Louisville Times, the Atlanta Constitution, and the Boston Globe.

As one who wholeheartedly endorsed Dean Griswold's nomination when it came before the Judiciary Committee last week, I know I express the deep pleasure and pride which his host of friends and

supporters share in the swift and sure approval which was given the nomination by the committee, and then by the Senate last Thursday. For, in him, the Nation has gained the services of one of the most highly respected and authoritative voices in legal and judicial circles.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times, Oct. 7, 1967]

A GRANITE BLOCK OF RECTITUDE

Like all presidents, President Johnson has made some questionable appointments. He also has made some outstandingly good ones. That is, he has named to high government office many men who, on their record, could be expected to give distinguished service.

One of these is Thurgood Marshall, former solicitor general of the United States, whom the president appointed to the Supreme Court and who participated in his first session of the court this week.

To take Marshall's place, President Johnson has named Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School, one of the truly eminent men in American law. A few years ago *The New York Times* commented:

"A lifelong Republican with a background of Midwest conservatism, Dean Griswold is built like a granite block and is just as inflexible in his conceptions of basic rectitude. Associates schooled in the subtleties and circumlocutions that so often attend legal discourse are constantly startled by his directness.

"Forthrightness is his outstanding quality," says one admiring colleague. "I misunderstood him for years because, in this devious world, I could not believe that he was a man who meant exactly what he said."

Griswold's name probably was impressed upon the public consciousness first back in the days, the early '50s, when Senator Joseph McCarthy was snapping and snarling at witnesses who used the Fifth Amendment's constitutional guarantee against self-incrimination. At a time when the Fifth Amendment, or the self-incrimination part of it, was under heaviest attack, Griswold was one of the ancient guarantee's most effective defenders.

Speaking generally of all the inherited freedoms at the height of the McCarthy clamor, Griswold said he thought it was healthy for the nation to be reminded occasionally that it had to continue to fight for the freedoms the founders of the country had established.

"If we take these rights for granted," he said, "if we accept them as a matter of course, we may simply fritter them away, and end by losing them, and possibly we deserve to lose them."

In accepting the appointment as solicitor general, Griswold is returning to his first employer. His first real job after graduation from Harvard Law in 1929 was as a staff lawyer in the solicitor general's office in Washington. He became a tax expert and when he returned to Harvard after the Hoover administration was succeeded by that of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes said his departure would cost the government a great deal of money.

Griswold now returns to the government, and the government gains more than money.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Oct. 6, 1967]

THE NEW SOLICITOR GENERAL

WASHINGTON.—Many intellectuals find Lyndon Johnson unimaginative or worse. But he keeps coming up with key appointments that show savvy. John Gardner was

conceded to be a superlative choice at Health, Education and Welfare. Arthur Goldberg made the President's judgment look good first on the Supreme Court and then at the United Nations.

Johnson did it again this week. The vacancy was in the subcabinet post of solicitor general, which Thurgood Marshall vacated when he went on the Supreme Court. The job is an important one—prime legal advocate for the U.S. government—and it has always carried a certain prestige.

But when Johnson picked the dean of the Harvard Law School, Erwin Griswold, he raised the prestige of the job to the top rung within the legal profession and outside it.

Not the least surprised was Dean Griswold. "I got a telephone call saying I was under consideration and asking if I would accept if chosen," he said. The suggestion astounded him. But he thought it over and decided he might be interested. He had been at Harvard 21 years and, at age 63, was beginning to feel he had made his contribution there.

"Anyway," he said, "I figured when they checked a little further and learned about my Republican background, they'd drop me out of it." On the contrary, the Republican dean quickly got another call inviting him to fly out to the Texas ranch. The President personally drove him from the airstrip, announced his appointment at a conference in the press shed, sent Lady Bird back to the airstrip with him, and flew him back to Boston in time for him to make a night speech after traveling 3,500 miles in one day. The crusty dean, who is not an impressionable man, was in Washington Thursday making his plans like a young lawyer who has just hung out his shingle. The possibilities of the post excite him. As a liberal originator of legal philosophy, he is bound to bring new thought and heightened power to it.

If the Senate Judiciary Committee, at its confirmation hearings, expects to encounter a dreamy academic, it's in for a surprise. Griswold has argued dozens of cases before the Supreme Court—and has freely expressed some tart reservations about the Court's philosophy as well.

He is something of a terror as an interrogator, as can be sworn to by many witnesses who came before the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, while he served on it. Zealously proud of the legal profession, he was outraged whenever he encountered subversions of civil rights by legal bodies. Few can forget him marching up to a voting registrar in Jackson, Miss., and demanding that the hapless official read and interpret an unfathomable section of the Constitution which the registrar himself had been requiring Negro would-be voters to interpret. In a long and painful minute of television silence, the registrar flunked.

The grumpy, logical, incorruptible mind will be spoken in behalf of justice on the national scene for years to come, and the office of solicitor general is unlikely to be the same again.

[From the Boston Globe, Oct. 6, 1967]

LAWYER TO THE GOVERNMENT

The office of Solicitor General is not a particularly conspicuous one. It is of less than Cabinet rank, and it is not the kind of post from which a man is rocketed to fame and fortune.

Yet it is vitally important to the smooth functioning of the government. The Solicitor General is the chief trial lawyer for the government. He supervises the preparation of the government's cases before the Supreme Court and often argues these cases in person. At the request of the Attorney General he may appear in any U.S. court or, where the government's interest is involved, in any state court.

By appointing Harvard Law School Dean Erwin N. Griswold as the new Solicitor General, succeeding Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, the President has made a ten-strike. Dean Griswold is not only a distinguished legal scholar and school administrator, he is also a lawyer of proven brilliance who began his legal career as an assistant in the office to which he is now being recalled.

President Johnson has stepped outside politics in making this appointment (the dean is a lifelong Republican) and by so doing has served both his administration and the public well. By the same token the dean, by plunging, if not into politics, into the uncertainties of government office, has also earned the public's special thanks.

THE WELFARE OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, during the past weekend it became necessary for Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul H. Nitze to issue a public statement concerning photographs and other editorial matter soon to be released for American news consumption which has been made available through North Vietnam channels.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement appear following my remarks, because I believe it is of vital importance for the widest possible number of Americans to be made aware of the circumstances under which this material is being released.

I am one of a large number of Members of the Congress who have been very concerned about the welfare of our American servicemen, most of them pilots, who are being held by North Vietnam. We have voiced the concern of the American people and of the Federal Government for the safety of these Americans.

Many of us have tried through the International Red Cross and through other channels to reach these Americans on behalf of their families and in the name of humanity to give them that brief comfort that can come through contact with their loved ones. These efforts have been largely unsuccessful and there has been no significant recognition given by the North Vietnamese either to the International Red Cross or to the mandates of the Geneva Convention.

Rather, we are now to be on the receiving end of a calculated and brazen propaganda effort designed to demonstrate that a nation which will not honor the Red Cross nor the families of these prisoners is the dispenser of humane treatment and has a concern for the welfare of the U.S. prisoners.

There is only one way for North Vietnam to prove its good faith or its recognition of the basic guarantees for prisoners afforded by virtually every country in the world. That way is to permit these prisoners to send and receive letters and for their prisons to be opened for inspection by humanitarian groups of the representatives of neutral nations. Anything less should be branded for what it is: the brazen trafficking in propaganda for the purposes of concealing the true nature of the situation.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCERN EXPRESSED FOR CAPTURED
AMERICAN SERVICEMEN

Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul H. Nitze today issued the following statement concerning U.S. military men held as prisoners of war in North Vietnam:

The Hanoi government has thus far refused to abide by provisions of the Geneva Convention covering prisoners of war. Representatives of the International Red Cross continue to be denied access to prisoners of war held in North Vietnam. Mail privileges to and from families are restricted or totally denied. No list of prisoners has been provided to the International Red Cross as required by the Convention. Attempts by the State and Defense Departments and the International Red Cross to secure compliance with requirements of the Geneva Convention have been persistently rebuffed. These attempts will continue.

On 8 September 1967, the Department of Defense announced the formation of a top-level Prisoner of War Policy Committee which reports to me on all matters within the cognizance of the Defense Department concerning our military personnel reported as being missing or held captive. The Chairman of this Committee is Paul C. Warnke, Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs). In the course of his Committee's work, it has examined a matter of great sensitivity. This concerns the treatment of United States servicemen who are being held as prisoners of war in North Vietnam.

The callous refusal by the Hanoi government to fulfill its obligations under the Geneva Convention is compounded by yet another violation of international law and decency. The enemy's propaganda apparatus now is at work to exploit these military men. As has been reported in recent news stories, the communists are trafficking in prisoner of war propaganda films and photographs.

The Geneva Convention, to which North Vietnam subscribes, clearly states that military men who are held as prisoners of war must not be put on exhibition. Yet this is exactly what the Hanoi government has been doing with its parade of prisoners through the streets of Hanoi and its other filmed public displays of our captured servicemen. On a carefully selected basis, Hanoi's leaders have been permitting hand-picked newsmen to film and photograph a few prisoners. Then, in collusion with such other communist governments as East Germany, Hanoi has arranged for propaganda films of U.S. prisoners of war to be sold throughout the world for a price.

In view of the deep interest we all have in the welfare of our service personnel in enemy hands, I can readily understand the desire of American news organizations to obtain these films from whatever sources are available. But it is important that the American people know that these films are communist propaganda and that this propaganda is being sold for hard cash.

Even as propaganda the films have carried their own tell-tale mark of fakery; instances have been uncovered in which the enemy has used the deceitful technique of dubbing voices. In other instances the physical appearance or behavior of the captured men belied any thought that their appearances or their statements were voluntary.

The leaders in Hanoi should recognize their responsibilities under the Geneva Convention; they should provide the International Red Cross with a list of our captured servicemen; they should permit representatives of the International Red Cross to visit all prisoners of war compounds; and they should open up their mails so that all of the prisoners of war can send and receive letters.

Contrary to Hanoi's propaganda claims, American prisoners have been able to write or receive letters in only a handful of instances.

While the Government strives to assist these families in every way possible during this trying period, nothing short of knowing with certainty that their men are alive and being treated decently will relieve their anxiety. Only Hanoi can do this. The United States has made a number of efforts through the International Committee of the Red Cross and neutral nations to get Hanoi to comply with the Convention and to demonstrate that they are treating the prisoners of war decently. These efforts, so far, have been unavailing.

All our citizens, particularly those brave wives and parents and children who wait for the return of their loved ones, should be aware of the practices of Hanoi in merchandizing at a price propaganda films and photographs of U.S. military men.

The enemy is seeking to exploit these prisoners. The Defense Department wants the communist propagandists to know that the American public and the rest of the free world are aware of the humiliating treatment being accorded the prisoners of war in Hanoi.

All of us who are concerned with the welfare of these men and their families will, of course, look with interest and concern at any films that are made available. We shall also look at these films and photographs with the knowledge of exactly what they are—callous communist propaganda.

POSSIBLE SHORTAGE OF HOUSING
FUNDS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, once again the interest rates on home mortgages are easing up. Whereas the average rate for home mortgages had declined to 6.44 percent in May and June, since that time it has edged up to 6.49 percent. Mortgage bankers and others in the housing industry fear a repetition of the near monetary crisis in 1966 which had such a disruptive effect upon the housing industry. Recently, the Wall Street Journal published an article on the outlook for mortgage credit. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD. I believe all of us in Congress must be alert to prevent the repetition of the 1966 experience.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING GLOOM: MORTGAGE BANKERS SEE SMALL UPTURN AT BEST IN 1968 BUILDING STARTS—SERIOUS TROUBLE SEEN IF TAX BILL LOSSES—INTEREST RATES BEGIN CREEPING UP AGAIN—FUNDS DIVERTED INTO BONDS

(By Jim Hyatt)

DALLAS.—At best, 1968 won't be a very good year for home builders and buyers.

At worst, it could be a disaster.

That's the lugubrious consensus of dozens of housing-finance experts interviewed here at the convention of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America. A majority agree that:

Despite the current easy-money policy of the Federal Reserve System, the supply of money for home-mortgage loans is growing tighter, with little prospect that cash-rich insurance companies and other investors will be lured back into financing new homes soon.

Interest rates on home mortgages are firm at near-record levels and are likely to edge higher in the next three to six months.

Consequently, little if any further increase in housing starts above current levels can be

expected in the foreseeable future. Most forecasts call for about 1,400,000 starts next year. That would be up from the 1,250,000 expected this year but considerably below the 1,500,000 to 1,600,000 yearly level achieved between 1962 and 1965—to say nothing of the nearly 2,000,000 starts in record year of 1950. It also would mean little or no advance beyond the annual rate of 1,381,000 starts achieved at last count in August—high-water mark so far in a recovery from the postwar low hit in October 1966, when last year's drastic credit squeeze had its worst effect on building and the annual rate of starts slid to 845,000.

IF SURCHARGE LOSES

These forecasts assume Congress will enact the 10% income-tax surcharge President Johnson has requested to counter inflation. But chances have increased greatly in recent days that an election-conscious Congress will kill the surcharge. If it does, mortgage men fear, Government borrowing to finance a record Federal deficit will push up all interest rates sharply, including those on mortgage loans, and sop up investment funds that otherwise might go into housing. Also, the Federal Reserve might well feel impelled to tighten credit drastically again, as it did in 1966.

For home-building, the result could be a "debacle," says Raymond H. Lapin, president of the Federal National Mortgage Association, a Government agency that buys mortgages from investors. "If we don't get the tax increase, pretty soon we'll be looking on 1967 as the good old days."

Though Mr. Lapin, as a Johnson Administration official, might not be unbiased, his prediction is echoed—though somewhat less forcefully—by private mortgage men. "Home-building could be worse than 1966 (when housing starts totaled about 1.2 million) if the surtax isn't passed," says Albert Rohnstedt, chairman of a mortgage banking subsidiary of Lomas & Nettleton Financial Corp., Dallas. R. A. Griswold, president of City-Wide Mortgage Co., Kansas City, Mo., agrees that if the tax bill fails "housing starts will dry up as the Federal Reserve tightens up on credit."

TIGHT MONEY ANYWAY?

There also is a still more gloomy minority opinion expressed by E. A. Johnson, vice president and treasurer of Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co. "I'm satisfied we're in for tight money in the next six months" whether or not the tax surcharge passes, he says. Consequently, he expects 1968 housing starts at best to equal the 1.2 million of 1966.

Even now, the flow of money into housing is not as abundant as the flow of savings into banks, savings and loan associations and life insurance companies indicates it should be. It's such savings that normally are channeled into mortgage loans. According to the National Association of Home Builders, the net increase in such savings this year will total a record \$50 billion, double the 1966 total and \$9 billion above the previous record set in 1965.

The trouble, from the viewpoint of home buyers and builders, is that a disproportionate amount of these savings are being diverted from mortgages to the bond market, where heavy corporate and Government borrowings have driven interest yields above those on home-mortgage loans. "We're getting up to 7%, sometimes over," on bond investments, says John S. Pillsbury Jr., president of Northwestern National Life Insurance Co., Minneapolis.

"NONE WOULD BE FINE"

"The supply of money is great, but we're directing it into bonds like everyone else is," says Arthur Heigl, assistant vice president of Midwest Federal Savings & Loan Association, Minneapolis. A Southwestern mortgage broker adds that, with bond yields so high,

"most any investor will tell you that if he didn't have any home loans at all, he'd be satisfied."

The rise in bond yields is beginning to pull up mortgage interest rates again, too. The average interest rate on new-home mortgages, including fees, dropped from a record 6.69% last December to 6.44% in May and June, but it has since inched up again, to 6.47% in August. The average interest rate on existing-home mortgages hit 6.49% in August, up from 6.41% in June, though below the 6.68% of last December.

Mortgage bankers are just about unanimous in the view that rates will continue to creep higher in coming months, whatever happens to the tax-surge bill.

"Our market (for home loans) in Wichita has been about 6 1/2%, but we look for it to go to 7 1/2%" within 90 days, says an official of Fourth National Bank & Trust Co., Wichita. In the Dallas area, Glenn W. Justice, president of Glenn Justice Mortgage Co., foresees interest rates of "6 3/4 to 7%" by next March, up roughly 1/4 percentage point from now. Another mortgage banker forecasts a one-quarter to one-half point rise across the nation by next spring.

A few mortgage bankers see signs that rising yields are beginning to attract more money into mortgage loans. "California savings and loan associations are aggressively seeking mortgages now for the first time in 18 months," says Jess Hay, president of Lomas & Nettleton of Dallas. He adds that "within the past few weeks" his company has obtained loan commitments from Eastern savings and loan associations, too.

Even the optimists, however, don't seem to expect the supply of mortgage money under the best conditions to become ample enough to spark a really big increase in homebuilding. Despite the "astoundingly large" increase in net savings this year, "it is expected that there will be no significant loosening in (housing) credit for the first quarter of 1968 and very likely through the rest of the year," comment Michael Sumichrast and Norman Farquhar, economists of the National Association of Home Builders. Consequently, they say, "housing starts in 1968 will fall to increase as rapidly as in previous times of recovery after a tight-money period."

The NAHB projects a gain of about 10% over this year, to about 1,380,000 units in 1968. This is slightly under the forecast of 1,430,000 units that resulted from a recent survey of more than 300 members of the National Association of Business Economists.

Some mortgage men see obstacles beyond tight money in the way of even a 10% gain in 1968 housing starts. Mr. Heigl of Midwestern Federal S&L expects next year's starts to drop below or at best equal this year's total partly because house prices are rising faster than wages and salaries of buyers.

"The cost of sheetrock (for insulation) went up a few weeks ago, and the effect is \$100 per house," he says. "We also have a new 3% sales tax in Minnesota that increases home prices." Because of these higher prices, he says, "people who barely qualified for a loan on a certain house last spring can't qualify now."

Though most mortgage bankers think defeat of President Johnson's tax bill would be disastrous for housing, they don't believe passage of the bill would be any great boon. While the surcharge might curb inflation enough to avert a new siege of tight credit, "it's not going to create any more money," says an official of Gulf Coast Investment Co., Houston. A minority of mortgage men even fear that the tax increase, by reducing the after-tax income of would-be home buyers, will deter some people from purchasing homes—though they concede failure to increase taxes would have an even worse effect on the overall home-building industry.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: A FIRST-ORDER PROBLEM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, recently one of my constituents, Mrs. Harold A. McKenzie, a schoolteacher of Appleton, Wis., called to my attention an excellent article entitled, "Where Will We Put All That Garbage?" published in *Fortune Magazine* for October 1967.

The article, written by Tom Alexander, presents a thorough analysis of the problem of waste management. It discusses some of the efforts being made in this field and suggests other approaches.

Calling for "new patterns of cooperation among Federal, State, municipal, and county agencies," Mr. Alexander states:

The present approaches to waste handling are inadequate, expensive and wasteful of natural resources.

He suggests a "regional approach" as the prerequisite to solving "the waste management dilemma."

There can be no doubt that the problem of the disposal of the trash of our affluent society is one of the most unappealing yet pressing problems we face. I commend the article to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE WILL WE PUT ALL THAT GARBAGE?

(By Tom Alexander)

Just about any schoolboy can figure out that roughly as much material must be taken out of a community as is brought in if something altogether desperate isn't to happen eventually. But whereas goods are brought into communities via elaborate networks of transportation, organization, and management, the equally voluminous wastes are taken out and disposed of almost in after-thought. Up till now, Mother Nature has pretty well covered for these casual attitudes toward waste handling. The natural sinks of water, air, and land and nature's destructive processes have usually made it possible for urban, rural, and industrial man to manage, with a modicum of effort, to place his wastes far enough out of sight and smell to keep them out of mind. But urban man is finding out that this approach isn't good enough any more. Despite spending some \$3 billion annually on municipal refuse disposal, most U.S. cities have fallen behind, and most face genuine solid-waste crises within two to fifteen years. Such cities as San Francisco, Washington, D.C., Chicago, and New York are at the crisis point already. Curiously, the agricultural community, too, finds itself with its manures and other wastes piling up faster than farmers can get rid of them.

Both the city's and the farm's problems come about for related reasons—shortage of disposal sites changes of process and materials plus the newly awakened concern over the health hazards of some of the traditional modes of waste disposal. And behind all of these is the relentless concentration of population. An analogy could be made with living organisms: simple one-celled animals need only primitive processes for handling wastes such as exudation through their cell walls. But all large organisms have complex organs for excretion, often more elaborate than the organs for nourishment.

In belated recognition of the waste problem, considerable effort is now going into improving our technology of waste handling. The main spur was the federal Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, which exists only be-

cause of the recent alarm over air pollution. Solid-waste disposal was recognized as a prime source of air pollutants, and to make federal funds available, a solid-waste act was passed as Title 2 of the 1965 air-pollution bill. The bait of federal funds attracted scientists into the notoriously uninspiring field of solid-waste research. What they found there provoked a shudder of alarm and a massive diversion of attention to solid-waste technology.

It now seems clear that technology alone is not the answer, and perhaps even that too many brains are now engaged in redundant investigations of the few conceivable engineering approaches. Before much long-term progress can be made in meeting the solid-waste crisis, new patterns of cooperation will have to emerge among federal, state, municipal, and county agencies. New systems of incentives may have to be legislated to encourage an economics of disposal to complement the orthodox economics of production, supply, and demand. New kinds of authorities or corporations may have to come into being to plan, capitalize, and manage new kinds of disposal systems—systems more versatile and flexible than a missile warning network or a telephone company, and just as important.

"POLLUTE THY NEIGHBOR"

The social metabolism of the urban U.S. currently appears to generate some six to eight pounds per person per day of waste products—garbage, paper, grass clippings, old autos, dead cats, demolition materials—or about double the weight of forty years ago. The U.S. Public Health Service expects this to double again in about twenty years. Most of the increase is attributable to the tremendous growth in use of paper products and packaging of various kinds. Nearly all foods and goods the housewife buys come in some kind of preprocessed packaged form. Furthermore, the volume of household waste is increasing far more rapidly than the weight. This reflects not only the shift toward paper but also the trend toward thinner grades of paper that, pound for pound, take up far more space when crumpled as refuse.

In the majority of U.S. cities and towns, the preferred solid-waste handling techniques entail gathering the trash noisily and expensively into trucks, carrying it outside the city limits, and dumping it upon a neighboring political jurisdiction. Sometimes when a dump becomes too large or too much of a nuisance, fires are started so as to permit obliging winds to carry off the dry and burnable fractions of paper, autos, and cats in the form of an oily, rich-smelling smoke.

But as surrounding communities have become either built up or fed up with this policy of "pollute thy neighbor," and as people have begun speaking badly of black, oily smoke, most cities appear about to run out of garbage room. In Washington, D.C., the citizenry has raised a barrage of organized protest over the city's famous evil-smoking Kenilworth Dump, located only five miles from the White House. Sixty percent of the refuse from the nine counties surrounding lovely San Francisco Bay is dumped along the bay shore. Now a state commission has ruled out the use of additional bay shore for dumping.

The most sophisticated techniques in common usage are the so-called "sanitary" landfill and municipal incineration. The principle of the sanitary landfill is to cover over each day's production of refuse with a layer of dirt to contain the odors and emerging fly pupae and to exclude rats and moisture. Unfortunately, landfilling takes a lot of dirt and a lot of space—an acre of ground piled seven feet high for every ten thousand people every year. New York annually uses up some 150 acres on the southern end of Staten Island even though the city first reduces the volume of part of its wastes through incineration. City officials estimate that New

York will use up its supply of landfill space in about ten years. Meanwhile, it costs nearly \$30 a ton to collect, transport, and dispose of New York's refuse—or three times the cost of a ton of West Virginia coal, mined and delivered in New York.

Theoretically, high-temperature incinerators should be able to reduce the total volume of municipal wastes by 75 to 90 percent, thereby cutting the demand for landfill. But almost none of the incinerators currently in operation in the U.S. meet the standards for air-pollution emissions that most experts recommend. Some have been shut down for this reason. New incinerators have been designed with elaborate electrostatic precipitators and gas scrubbers that can meet these standards, but both capital and operating cost are extremely high—totaling five or six times as much as the cost of sanitary landfill. Furthermore, such incinerators are usually designed for more or less specific refuse components, and such specifics are hard to predict over the next decades. Paper dresses, for example, are purposely made nonflammable, so that it takes higher-temperature incinerators to make them burn.

HOW TO FERTILIZE RHODE ISLAND

Down on the farm, if anything, things are in some ways worse than in the city. It has recently been calculated, for instance, that one cow produces more waste material than 16.4 mid-twentieth-century Americans—some six to twenty-five pounds of manure for every pound of weight gained, three pounds for every pound of milk. In fact, total agricultural wastes of all kinds, including manures and food-processing residues, far outweigh the wastes produced by humans and their nonagricultural industries. Reports Professor Samuel Hart of the University of California at Davis, "If all the animal manure produced by the nation's livestock each year were spread evenly over the state of Rhode Island, forty-nine other states would have no agricultural sanitation problems and it would be several inches deep in Rhode Island."

Through the ages, most of the agricultural wastes were cycled back to the land and helped enrich its yield, but the economic urge to produce near the big markets is changing all that. Now most beef cattle and poultry spend all or much of their lives in the confines of a feedlot or poultry house, often on the outskirts of a large metropolis. Because of the transportation and labor costs of using manure, farmers now prefer the cheap, concentrated, and easy-to-apply artificial fertilizers. The upshot is that the far reaches of a number of big cities are marked by growing piles of manure, with attendant flies and severe drainage problems. For instance, rain runoff from feedlots has polluted nearly all the rivers and streams in Kansas. A complicating effect is that much of the soluble artificial fertilizer is leached from the fields during rains and finds its way into watercourses and lakes. There it stimulates the growth of aquatic plants that die eventually and in decaying deplete the dissolved oxygen in the water. This, in turn, lessens the water's ability to degrade sewage and, of course, the rain runoff from manure piles.

In both city and country, nature is increasingly being presented with a battery of wastes that she simply can't degrade. Nonreturnable glass bottles, aluminum cans, and junked autos litter the landscape and are virtually indestructible by natural processes. Bacterial cleanup agents are unable to break down many synthetic chemical products, including plastics and detergents. Industrial wastes such as steel-pickling and metal-plating baths are often discharged to persist with scarcely diminished toxicity for the entire length of a river. In other cases, toxic chemicals are impounded on land but percolate downward to pollute permanently

groundwater sources. One alternative is to dry and burn some of the substances, but then they usually produce intolerable smogs, odors, or health hazards.

Several moves are afoot in federal and state agencies to ban or tax nonreturnable bottles and such nondegradable packaging materials as aluminum and plastics. (Sixteen states have introduced legislation against nonreturnable bottles.) The container and packaging industries are trying to come up with some kind of constructive measure to head off legislation. Two months ago, at the instigation of Chairman William F. May of the American Can Co., the trade associations from the container, paper, steel, aluminum, glass, and plastics industries formed a Materials Disposal Research Council to do something about the growing waste contribution from the packaging revolution. Whether this will turn into anything more than a public-relations gesture is still unclear, but May is suggesting that the council pursue a three-pronged approach: further attempts at antilitter education, studies of systems for collecting and reducing the volume of wastes, and research into container and packaging materials that either are not so durable or can be more easily processed for reuse. On and off for several years now various companies, notably the Adolph Coors brewery, National Brewing, Continental Oil, and Reynolds Metals, have experimented with paying the public to return empty aluminum cans, even though the salvage was uneconomical. Some of the tests have run into opposition from the retail outlets that were given the responsibility for collecting and sorting the salvaged items.

Many long-range thinkers cling to the view that somehow we must find ways of recycling waste materials back into useful form. Unfortunately the current economic trends seem to be against such a practice. Rising labor costs and the use of synthetic materials have virtually brought an end to most of the old picking and sorting of rags from municipal refuse. Large office buildings used to be paid for their wastepaper, which was then repulped and remade into paper. Today it can cost \$37 a ton in New York to get it carried away. New industrial processes such as the oxygen steel-smelting process use less scrap iron, and as a consequence the derelict automobile is often not worth picking up and hauling to a processing yard.

Attempting to circumvent such economics, Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, chairman of a recent blue-ribbon waste-management committee of the National Academy of Science-National Research Council, argues that potentially valuable wastes should be "banked" so they may easily be recovered at some later date when economics or technology has changed. Spilhaus points to the huge quantities of tailings from the gold mines in his native South Africa. As technology has developed, some of these tailing piles have been profitably reworked as many as three separate times, not only for gold but for uranium. Spilhaus suggests that all the junked autos, for instance, ought to be piled into landscaped dirt-covered hills, hills that might be mined when some future shortage of high-yield ores made scrap iron more valuable.

The goal of many of the ninety-two research and pilot demonstration projects funded under the federal Solid Waste Disposal Act is to find ways to salvage some kind of benefit from wastes. Notable among these is a project at Virginia Beach, Virginia, to use the sanitary-landfill technique to create a sixty-foot-high hill of municipal refuse. When finished, the hill will become a combination amphitheatre, soapbox-derby ramp, and landscaped park. University of Maryland scientists have a federal grant to develop foods and food additives for humans and animals from the wastes produced by the food-processing industries. They suggest, for example, that the U.S.'s annual ten million

tons of tomato wastes—vines, leaves, and green and overripe tomatoes—could provide protein concentrates for undernourished parts of the world. Other federally supported research efforts are aimed at extracting waste heat from incinerators or methane gas and useful chemicals from waste materials. Europeans, in particular, have long put incinerator heat to work. West Berlin's huge new municipal incinerating complex provides steam for both electricity and central heating, while the residual clinkers are used as ersatz gravel. In the U.S., the town of Hempstead, Long Island, operates an imaginative refuse incinerator that drives both a 2,500-kilowatt electric power plant and a 420,000-gallon-a-day water-desalting plant.

THE FARMERS' SENSE OF HUMUS

By conventional reckoning, the value added to waste through whatever processing is employed will usually be less than the cost of the processing. Take for example the efforts by a host of companies to turn municipal refuse into an organic compost that could be sold to farmers. Garbage and the paper components of refuse can be put through an accelerated bacterial process that in a few days or weeks turns them into a dark brown, odorless, soil-like material that is valuable as a soil conditioner. Such compost has long been used in Europe. But of the thirteen compost plants that have been set up in the U.S. by private firms or cities, nine have already closed down because of a lack of market. In most cases, transportation costs have forced the price of the compost up to the point where it could not compete with artificial fertilizers, especially since it needed a fertilizer supplement anyway.

Soil scientists agree that heavily farmed land should have some sort of organic humus added periodically. In the land-rich U.S. this is usually supplied by letting land lie fallow for a year and then plowing in a cover crop. But as the world's population grows, fallow land will become more and more of a luxury. Now it is being suggested that the city should pay the cost of making the compost and perhaps even of plowing it into the farmers' land and be thankful that it has a place to put its refuse. Chicago already helps defray the high cost of disposing of the semi-solid, nutrient-rich "sludge" residue from its sewage treatment plants by drying and barging it to Florida and selling it for use on citrus groves. Now Chicago is investigating piping the sludge some ninety miles for use on farmed-out lands in Kankakee County, Illinois. If this sludge could be mixed with refuse compost, it would make the compost considerably more valuable as a soil conditioner and nutrient.

Much of our helplessness in this area arises because most governmental units cannot cope with the problems. Political leaders don't find much glamour in solid waste. "You don't see a governor putting his gold plaque on a landfill," comments Dr. P. H. McGahey, director of the University of California's Sanitary Engineering Research Laboratory at Richmond. In matters of waste handling, city does not speak to city, nor city to county. For instance, Leonard S. Wegman, an engineering consulting firm for solid wastes, recently worked out a cooperative disposal system for the three Connecticut towns of East Hartford, Glastonbury, and Manchester. The Wegman plan proposed modernizing East Hartford's air-polluting, inadequate incinerator for use by all three towns with the cost to be shared by all. But East Hartford citizens objected to the idea of handling the other towns' refuse and defeated the plan.

Individual towns often spend large sums on their own land-filling equipment, and it stands idle most of the day. Meanwhile the town can't afford to clean up the sewage discharge or the air pollution that is the bane of the neighboring town downstream or downwind. Air-pollution controllers end up

cleaning up the air and discharging the wastes to rivers, while water-pollution controllers put theirs on land. The solid-waste controller pollutes all three.

THE COST OF CURING AN EYESORE

Our accustomed totting up of benefits versus costs is difficult to apply in the instance of pollution. It is hard even to list all the direct and indirect costs of air, water, and land pollution to society—the shirts that must be changed twice a day, the funneling of vital soil nutrients and trace elements to the city and thence to irretrievability, the commuter's long, expensive haul to a cleaner suburb, the rat and fly eradication efforts, the foot cut on the beer-can tab. And how could anyone even attempt to put a price on an eyesore? But even if such calculations could be made, it is even more difficult to devise economic incentives for recognizing the long-run needs of large regions. How do you persuade city dwellers to dispose of their wastes in such a way as to lessen the long-term drain on agricultural or industrial resources?

There are hopeful signs that some of the compartmentalization is vanishing. At several places, such as Northwestern University and the universities of Florida, West Virginia, and Cincinnati, the air, water, and land pollution experts are drawing together into "environmental engineering" groups, where "waste management" is the byword and "systems engineering" the approach. And in those areas of the country where even minimal efforts have been made toward cooperation among political jurisdictions, the results have often been impressive. One of the best refuse-disposal systems in the country serves seventy separate municipalities within Los Angeles County, including part of the city of Los Angeles itself. There collection and disposal costs—even with high land prices and long hauls—are among the lowest in the country. In the city of Los Angeles they average \$12 a ton. The municipalities achieve this mostly through sharing landfill sites and through economies of scale. Some natural advantages, plus imaginative area-wide planning and careful salesmanship, appear to be the main reasons why the county is already fairly well assured on its waste-disposal needs through the year 2005. And, through their pooling of resources, the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts can afford a staff of engineers researching various advanced schemes for waste transportation and disposal for the periods after that.

Oddly, the spirit of cooperation in Los Angeles County stems from the joint need to provide a system of drains to carry off torrential rainfalls. Formed in the early 1900's, this Drainage District system later inspired a unique Sanitation District system that built a huge network of sewerage lines and treatment plants to serve a large section of the county. Finally, after World War II, the county woke up to its now famous smog problem. In 1957 the county banned the thousands of individual back-yard incinerators and closed down the large municipal and industrial incinerators as well. It was left to the Sanitation Districts to find something to do with the 4,500 extra tons of refuse that would be piling up each day.

The districts' first move was to attempt to buy a huge abandoned quarry in Palos Verdes, ideally suited as a site for a sanitary landfill. Residents in that prosperous neighborhood fought the proposed purchase, being all too familiar with the smokes, odors, pests, and general unsightliness that characterized the privately operated refuse dumps then prevalent throughout the area. The Sanitation Districts nevertheless persisted, promising that not only would they cover each day's production of refuse in a nuisance-free way, but also that in the end the gaping quarry would become a landscaped community asset for Palos Verdes. Sure enough, five years later a section of the scar had

been quietly and painlessly converted into a public arboretum. With this and other similar triumphs skillfully publicized, the typical Los Angeles homebuyer's objections to having a "garbage dump" nearby were so well allayed that real-estate agents have little trouble selling \$100,000 homes overlooking a working landfill with the bulldozers nudging up alongside the terrace. Often the houses overlooking the fill command the highest prices because of the promise of a park.

Envious officials from other cities point out that Los Angeles is exceptional in having natural canyons where refuse can be piled up to 600 feet deep. The districts' chief engineer, John Parkhurst, counters that ample landfill area can usually be found within easy-haul distance of most municipalities if (1) they can only overcome their mutual distrust long enough to cooperate, and (2) they can allay the legitimate doubts in the minds of nearby landholders that they will operate a nuisance-free landfill. Frank Bowerman, formerly Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts engineer, who did much of the planning for the landfills, has offered the New York area a free suggestion as to how it might solve its refuse problems. Bowerman, who is now working on Aerojet-General's waste-management research, recommends that the trash be barged out into lower New York Harbor and used to construct an artificial island for New York's much-needed new jetport. He estimates that enough material would be available to build at least one 12,000-foot runway per year.

THE SYSTEMS APPROACH TO GARBAGE

Whatever the disposal method, the prerequisite to solving the waste-management dilemma is certainly some sort of regional approach. The regions might be small or very large—several villages or several states—but in each case they should be formed as geoeconomic entities, rather than along political boundary lines. Moving in this direction, Sweden recently established a new central agency called Statens Naturvårdsverk—or "Nature Management Board"—that will attempt eventually to coordinate the handling of all waste products for the entire country.

Beginning in 1964, the state of California hired Aerojet-General to make a systematic series of studies of waste management on a statewide basis. Though Aerojet got off to a less than impressive start in its first reports, the company has by now developed some convincing adaptations of the defense industry's techniques of systems analysis and cost-benefit studies for the over-all waste management of large regions. In one study Aerojet is attempting to assess the relative seriousness of all the "bad effects" from wastes in Fresno County, California—rats from garbage dumps, odors from manure piles, air pollution from burning agricultural wastes, and so on. Once the sources and relative disagreeableness of all possible pollutants are established, Aerojet will be in a position to compute how the county can spend a limited amount of money to the greatest advantage. Such cost-benefit studies can also prevent uneconomic overkill; Professor H. B. Gotaas, Dean of Northwestern University's Technological Institute as well as head of the institute's Environmental Engineering Group, believes that many areas are proposing to make rivers and streams cleaner than is economically justified. The money might better be spent on solid-waste or air-pollution technology, says Gotaas.

WAYS TO BEAT THE FREIGHT RATE

The major cost in any solid-waste disposal scheme, whether conducted on a regional basis or not, will be collection and transportation. As things stand now, from 75 to 90 percent of municipal refuse expenditures are absorbed by the armies of men and fleets of trucks that make the collections

from individual households. The members of New York City's 14,000-man sanitation department make an average of \$3 an hour, while the 1,800 garbage trucks contribute substantially to the noise, traffic congestion, and general nuisance of the city. New York's annual expenditure of nearly \$130 million might better go for building some sort of automated, nuisance-free collection system. If long-haul transportation costs could be reduced, cities might find ample place for their residue in abandoned quarries, strip mines, swamps, or mountain canyons.

New York City and Philadelphia have studies under way with the New York Central and Reading railways, respectively, to see whether long-haul railroad transportation of wastes to the abandoned strip mines of Pennsylvania or West Virginia would be feasible. Spilhaus has suggested that since most freight cars enter a city full and leave empty, it might be possible to load the dead-heading cars with bales of refuse. This recalls the laws of some medieval German towns that required every farm wagon bringing a load of produce to town to carry a load of municipal refuse out and dump it or plow it into the soil. With computers keeping track of railway cars, it is conceivable that even very long hauls might be possible, simply by taking advantage of the random movement of empty cars across the country.

The most sensible-sounding scheme for transporting wastes is simply to pump it out of town. Already Sweden and Britain have fitted several of their large scattered apartment complexes with tubes that transport bulk household refuse pneumatically to central incinerators as much as a mile and a half away. At the University of Pennsylvania, Professor Iraj Zandi has a federally supported project looking into the feasibility of collecting and pumping wastes in a liquid slurry form. Zandi has performed experiments that appear to show that if all ordinary municipal refuse—paper, tin cans, bottles, garbage, and so on—could be ground up in powerful household grinders or larger municipal grinders, it could be mixed with a small amount of water from the city sewer system and pumped out of town, perhaps more cheaply than it could be trucked out. Zandi's experiments show that the pipes could be surprisingly small—one only two inches in diameter could easily carry the wastes of a town of 10,000 or 15,000. And to save the costs of tearing up streets and buildings, most of these small solid-waste lines might be laid inside existing sewer lines, which are usually built outside to accommodate storm runoff. The pipes could lead to far-off places where landfill is genuinely needed—perhaps to abandoned strip mines or low-lying swamplands. As for cost, Zandi points to the experience with pipelines used for transporting slurried coal. When the first 100-mile stretch of coal pipeline was laid in eastern Ohio, it had the effect of reducing the local rate for transporting coal by railroad. And rail transportation is cheaper than the truck transportation now used for hauling wastes.

Going even further, Zandi envisions the possibility of magnetic and centrifugal sorting devices to separate metals, glass, and perhaps the undecomposable plastics for possible salvage. The remaining organic material then might be mixed with the semi-solid sludge residues from sewage treatment plants and manure from feedlots and the whole degraded biologically into compost, perhaps within the pipelines themselves.

A COMSAT FOR GARBAGE

Though much needs to be learned about the costs and practicality of long-distance refuse pipelines, one could envision networks of such pipelines carrying compost and sewage from many sources to marginal agricultural areas. Even though the initial capital costs of such a system might be high, they

would probably be offset by low operating costs. More important, there would be little noise, odor, unsightliness, and inconvenience. Furthermore, the network would double as an irrigation and fertilization system. It seems likely that some sort of utility company—wholly private like A.T. & T. or quasi-public like Comsat—would be best suited to plan, build, and operate such a regional network. The corporation could be paid a regulated price per ton or per household to get rid of all wastes. (Some items, such as bedsprings or large granite blocks from demolition, would probably still have to be hauled off specially, just as they are now.) Then such a profit-oriented company would try to make what extra money it could through cost cutting, salvage, irrigation charges, composting, or heat recovery.

But garbage network or no, one thing is clear: waste disposal will have to be done differently—and soon. The present approaches to waste handling are inadequate, expensive, and wasteful of natural resources. It appears to be only a matter of time before the congested areas of the U.S. will wake up to find garbage on their doorstep unless they reach out to avail themselves of the systems approach to waste disposal.

HIRE THE HANDICAPPED: A NATIONAL DUTY

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, as a fresh influx of disabled war veterans, the tragic and unfortunate victims of the protracted conflict in Vietnam, breaks into our midst, it is important to renew our resolve that all handicapped persons be provided with equality of opportunity to be gainfully employed.

The Spooner Advocate, a weekly newspaper in Spooner, Wis., whose editor is William W. Stewart, recently published a fine editorial which reflects recognition of this need and I commend it to the attention of other Senators, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIRE THE HANDICAPPED

Twenty years after the return of World War II veterans, we are witnessing a parallel and poignant chapter in our history. Disabled veterans are coming home from Vietnam in increasing numbers. With battlefield scars overshadowing their futures, they face the uncertainties of adjustment and acceptance in a society largely molded for the perfect.

In the world of work to which they return, their path has been smoothed by the several million handicapped workers who, in the past two decades, have demonstrated that ability counts more than disability. Many employers are convinced of the sound business advantages of hiring the handicapped—a conviction based on the records of productivity, reliability, and loyalty set by the handicapped themselves.

Many more handicapped applicants, however—fully rehabilitated and trained for work—are still waiting for a chance to prove their worth. Opportunities must be found for them, and a concerted effort is made each year during National Employ the Handicapped Week, which the Nation is observing October 1-7.

During this week, and in fact, throughout the year, let us exert our social responsibility toward our handicapped neighbors—not to offer them special privileges, which they do not seek, but to provide equality of opportunity. Once given the chance to work, the handicapped worker's performance will be

his own best persuader—that it's ability, not disability, that counts.

REPUBLICAN PARTY RESPONSIBILITY IN VIETNAM DEBATE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on October 9 the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] delivered a major address in the Senate on party responsibility in the Vietnam debate. The Chicago Sun-Times has published a lucid and forthright editorial supporting Senator SCOTT's position. The editorial points out that the national interest must not be subverted for partisan advantage by either political party or segment thereof. The editorial further points out that criticism simply to exploit the frustrations now facing our people are clearly a disservice to our Nation and offer no solution or workable alternative to our present involvement.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUTCH UNCLE TALK TO THE GOP

Sen. Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania speaks not only as a practical politician but he is on sound moral and patriotic grounds when he warns his fellow Republicans against making the war in Vietnam a partisan political issue.

The conduct of the opposition party during wartime must always be in a delicate balance between valid opposition to the administration in power and American loyalty to the office of the President. In World War II and in the Korean War the people went through the constitutional requirement of a divisive election, but as a nation the citizens had to show a united front to the world.

Now, with another presidential election coming up as American men fight another war overseas there is a natural temptation for Republicans to try to turn the frustration and dissatisfaction with the war to political advantage. To those who might be so tempted, Scott said that while there is room for dissent the Republican Party should not carry its criticism to the point where it would "undermine the stature of the Presidency." His words were particularly directed at those in his party who have no clear alternatives to the President's policies or who seem to be advocating a peace-at-any-price policy.

We take it that Scott was not directing his criticism at those who agree with Mr. Johnson on the need to provide the maximum possible deterrent to aggression but who believe as we do that he could put greater emphasis on getting the Communists to the peace table by a temporary cessation of bombing. Nor were his remarks directed at those who believe escalation of the war would bring peace faster. He aimed at those who carp at the President and his policies simply to exploit the frustration with the war that is felt by everyone, Democrat and Republican alike, and whose own position is ambiguous or defeatist.

Scott's Republican credentials are unsalable. A Philadelphia lawyer and World War II Navy veteran, he was chairman of the party during the 1948 presidential campaign. During the Eisenhower administration he was general counsel for the party. He served 16 years in the House and nine years in the Senate. He remembers well the campaigns in other war years. So does Sen. Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois who is backing President Johnson in the Vietnam war, regardless of the difference in their party affiliations.

Frustration and dissatisfaction with the war, Scott says, is not a "valid justification

for attacks upon the President, especially in the light of absence of alternative courses of action based on anything more substantial than a desire to get it over with and the hope that the other side will behave like good fellows. . . . When we undermine the stature of the Presidency and derogate from the prestige of its occupant, we do a disservice to ourselves, our political parties and the nation."

Scott said he did not want the Communists to gain "aid and comfort" in the belief they would profit by delayed peace moves until next year.

John M. Bailey, Democratic national chairman, was more blunt in criticizing Republicans who are trying to make the war a political issue.

"President Johnson seeks to prevent World War III," he said. "Most Republicans are trying to win the 1968 election any way they can. . . . We must drum away, day after day, the theme that preventing the world from blowing up must take precedence over partisan politics."

Most citizens will agree to that. If the Republicans have a firm and alternative policy to prevent the world from blowing up—and are agreed on it—they can seek the Presidency on that basis. But at the moment they are not in agreement on Vietnam except that they could do better than the present occupant of the White House. That is not a persuasive campaign argument. It has failed in other elections on other issues. Scott does his party members a service by reminding them of it.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE ACTION ON WIRETAPPING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, recently the press reported that the U.S. Judicial Conference endorsed wiretapping and, further, had endorsed specific bills.

A close look taken by John MacKenzie, the able staff writer of the Washington Post, at the recent Judicial Conference action on electronic eavesdropping reveals that the Federal judiciary may not have given wiretapping legislation its full endorsement.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. MacKenzie's article, published in yesterday's Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD. The article is entitled "Approval of Legalized Bug by Judiciary Stirs Confusion."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROVAL OF LEGALIZED "BUG" BY JUDICIARY STIRS CONFUSION (By John P. MacKenzie)

A close look at the recent U.S. Judicial Conference action on electronic eavesdropping reveals that the Federal judiciary may not have given "bugging" legislation the full endorsement claimed by House Republicans.

A still closer look at the way the Conference handled the wiretap-eavesdrop controversy also raises these questions:

Did the Conference members, 25 top Federal judges headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren, fully realize what they were doing when they endorsed the "purposes" of pending wire-tap legislation?

What is the proper role of the Conference, the administrative arm of the Federal judiciary, when Congress is considering controversial legislation that touches on the duties of judges?

News of the Sept. 22 Conference vote stunned the Johnson Administration and delighted Republicans and conservative Democrats. It was a severe blow to the Administration's Rights to Privacy bill and a wind-

fall for supporters of electronic surveillance as a weapon against organized crime.

Senators who complain frequently of judicial interference in legislative matter cited the Conference action with approval last week in successfully urging a Judiciary Subcommittee to add a wiretap-eavesdrop amendment to a pending crime bill.

To all appearances the Conference had studied six pending Senate and House bills, rendered a considered judgment against the Right to Privacy proposal, which was one of the six bills, and embraced court-supervised electronic surveillance subject only to amendments in line with the Supreme Court's latest "bugging" decision.

The Conference had approved the report of its criminal law committee, headed by Circuit Judge George C. Edwards of Detroit, endorsing as "most acceptable" the "purposes" of a bill introduced last January by Sen. John L. McClellan (D-Ark.).

This approval was conditioned on the McClellan bill's being "amended to comply with the standards of the opinion in *Berger v. New York*," the June 12 Supreme Court decision striking down New York's microphone "bugging" law.

The Court said a valid law would require more safeguards, similar to those of a conventional search warrant, for the protection of the person whose conversations the police are trying to overhear. Despite initial criticism, "bugging" advocates came to regard the decision as a "blueprint" for carefully drafted legislation.

Jubilant over the Conference move, leaders of the House Republican Task Force on Crime promptly introduced the latest version of the wiretapping-bugging proposals and said their bill was "supported by the Judicial Conference of the United States."

The Task Force declared that the Conference vote "represents the considered judgment of a purely judicial body" and was "volunteered and unsolicited."

"The impact of this report is staggering," said the Task Force, and it "utterly destroys whatever was left of the Administration's position" that all but national security agents' eavesdropping should be outlawed.

McClellan took the Senate floor to hail the Conference action. He called it "support of wiretap and eavesdrop legislation by the Federal judiciary."

The main trouble with these statements was that McClellan's own bill, the one chosen by the Judicial Conference, was only a wiretap bill—and said nothing about other forms of eavesdropping.

The Conference report hardly a model for legislators, had lent itself to McClellan's interpretation by blending a wiretap bill with a "bugging" court decision, but no one who has studied the Conference language can say with assurance what it really did mean.

Accounts differ on whether the Conference's nine-member criminal law committee or the full Conference made a deliberate, careful choice of the McClellan bill. Judge Edwards said it was "no snap judgment." Other sources indicated that the committee discussions failed to focus on differences between particular bills and that the full Conference spent only a few minutes approving the Committee report.

Conference and committee meetings were closed to the press and public in keeping with a policy designed to allow members to "speak freely and frankly" and encourage full debate of important issues.

Chief Justice Warren declined to discuss the matter, and Judge Edwards said he would give no detailed replies to questions about actions of his committee or the Conference without the Chief Justice's approval.

Judge Edwards, former Detroit police commissioner, is best known for his outspoken views on police interrogation methods and his vigorous support of the Supreme Court's 1966 decision limiting the use of confessions.

Less well known until recently has been his support for court orders allowing Federal and State law officers to eavesdrop in organized crime investigations.

The choice of the McClellan bill seemed strange to some non-Conference experts for two reasons.

First, among the half-dozen bills before the Conference, there was a bill dealing with both wiretapping and the use of hidden microphones. It was a bill introduced by Rep. William M. McCulloch (R-Ohio) in May.

Second, the McCulloch bill had been drafted partly in anticipation of the *Berger* decision and clearly conformed more closely than the McClellan bill to the Supreme Court's latest pronouncement. The new Republican Task Force bill is an amended—its supporters say a "tightened"—version of the McCulloch bill.

Further clouding the question of whether the Conference acted with full knowledge of what it was doing is the fact that the House Republicans were correct in calling the action "volunteered and unsolicited."

Traditionally, Conference actions approving or disapproving pending legislation have been taken in response to requests from congressional committees for the judges' views. At least three members of the Conference committee, including its chairman, Judge Edwards, were surprised last week to learn that Congress had not solicited their views on any of the six bills. It is likely that all but a few Conference members assumed Congress had asked for advice.

The apparent basis for tackling the issue this year was the fact that the House Judiciary Committee had asked the Conference, in 1965, for its opinion on an anti-eavesdrop bill and the Conference had responded with disapproval.

With little notice by the Conference membership, committee chairmen and staffers of the Conference increasingly have been combing the Congressional Record for legislation of interest to judges, referring it for consideration with or without a congressional request.

In this request the Conference has come a long way since Chief Justice Taft created its predecessor Conference of Senior Circuit Judges and Chief Justice Hughes established its secretariat and supporting personnel in the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts.

Initially the Conference concept was more narrowly limited to finding ways of running the courts more efficiently, cutting backlogs, clarifying court rules and the like.

But the lines dividing judicial administration, advisory opinions and political involvement have become increasingly fine. Bills to overturn Supreme Court criminal law rulings and "war on crime" bills for Federal aid to law enforcement—two other issues that prompted Conference votes last month—are highly political yet the Federal judiciary can argue that their effects, direct or indirect, on the judges' work entitle the judges' opinions to some weight.

The new problem, dramatized by wiretap-eavesdrop fiasco, is that the Conference has failed to make careful judgments in each case where the issue—and the choice to seek or avoid involvement—is on the borderline between court administration and the political thicket.

HIGHER GOVERNMENT SPENDING FORECAST SHOWS NEED FOR BETTER EVALUATION POLICIES

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, in his speech last week to the National Association of Business Economists, Prof. Murray Weidenbaum of Washington University estimated that total Government spending in fiscal 1968 would reach \$192 billion, some \$17 billion higher than the current fiscal year. And as Govern-

ment expenditures increase, so does the need rise for methods by which we can achieve maximum performance from each dollar spent.

Therefore, Congress must act to insure that budget policies lead to continued and stable economic growth. One area ranking among the most critical at present is that of the discount rate the Government uses in cost-benefit analysis.

Because the discount rate now employed in most long-range spending proposals is significantly lower than the comparable rate applied in the private sector, transfer of resources into the public accounts tends to create inflationary pressures and dampens overall economic growth. Congress must remember when it sanctions huge expenditures—such as the \$4.7 billion public works appropriation approved this week—that the low discount rate used to justify many expensive projects can cause serious economic dislocations in the future.

According to witnesses who appeared in recent hearings of the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economy in Government, the low 3¼ percent discount rate now utilized in cost-benefit analysis must be scrapped. The witnesses argued that the relevant rate should be the rate the private sector applies to its investment decisions—a rate which would be at a minimum of 10 percent, and, in many cases, is as high as 15 percent. In any case, our witnesses agreed that the absolute floor rate for Government projects should be the current yield on long-term Government securities, which is around 5 percent.

Had even the 5-percent discount rate been used in evaluating the public works appropriation, a number of projects could have been eliminated. As it stands, if Congress continues to approve spending requests for programs which yield low returns, the economic outlook will be one of ever-increasing inflationary pressures and sluggish growth patterns.

Mr. President, Congress must demand that alternative interest rates be applied to future spending proposals. I have already received such recalculations from two agencies on this year's budget requests. For next year, I hope that more agencies will be able to analyze their programs using various relevant discount rates.

SENATOR BENNETT OPPOSES HIGHWAY CUTBACK PROPOSAL

Mr. BENNETT, Mr. President, all of us have been much concerned lately with budget cuts and reducing expenditures. Because of the seriousness of the problem, it behooves the administration to make necessary and substantial reductions in the 1968 fiscal budget. Certainly such cuts must be made if the country's economic system is to continue without the heavy inflationary pressures which a huge deficit will present us.

I feel that the administration proposal to cut spending for Federal highway construction by as much as 50 percent is full of sound and fury and signifies nothing in the way of an actual budget reduction.

This attempt to twist the collective

arms of Congress into passing President Johnson's 10-percent surtax is a spoof.

Since Federal highway funds come out of a special trust fund, the highway fund reduction would not reduce the budget; thus this latest scheme to intimidate Congress is merely a shadow and not a substance of budget cutting.

The Federal highway program is one which benefits all Americans immensely. When the President becomes serious about budget cutting, logical areas have been repeatedly spelled out for him—areas which may be politically sensitive to the President but which must be faced sooner or later by him.

The Nation recognizes what is being done and questions the action of the President. I ask unanimous consent that two editorials, one from the Salt Lake Tribune, the other from the Deseret News, both dated October 12, which indicate the feelings of the people and the damaging impact of such a tactic upon the strikebound economy of Utah, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Oct. 12, 1967]

DON'T RANSOM BUDGET WITH ROAD FUNDS

The Johnson Administration's latest economy move, asking states to reduce highway construction, comes at a time when Utah, for one, can ill afford such frugality. And it shouldn't have to.

Really big road money dispensed through Washington, D.C. is for interstate, primary, secondary and urban highway projects and it is distributed from the Highway Trust Fund. This fund is distinct from other federal revenue sources and it is built by federal taxes on such things as fuel, tire and vehicle oil sales. Those who use the highways pay for highway improvements.

Administration spokesmen maintain the proposed slow-down is an inflation-curing device, but critics say it is the President's way of enlisting the states in his battle with Congress over 10 per cent surcharge tax vs. reduced budget expenditures.

In either case, the ends do not justify the means. Highway Trust Fund use has developed carefully scheduled planning. In Utah, the State Road Commission and Highway Department determine construction well in advance and employ personnel in sufficient numbers to meet projected goals. Arbitrary delays—one was imposed a year ago—prolong already tardy highway completions and force employment dislocations all down the line. Any inflation-nipping contribution made by fund hold-backs is wiped out in the highway program by wasted motion and restarts.

Burdened by Vietnam War, Great Society and ambitious space race needs, the federal budget is threatened with a 29 billion dollar deficit. Just how cutting Highway Trust Fund expenditures will ease that situation is difficult to understand.

It is suggested that reduced highway construction will leave money in the trust fund for a "loan" to the general fund, thereby taking some pressure off general appropriations. Look out Peter, here comes light-fingered Paul again! Even if the administration could swing this risky deal, any loans from the trust fund would have to be repaid with interest.

Some 180 million dollars is appropriated annually from the federal general fund for highway jobs on U.S. property—national forests, parks, Indian reservations—and for other special improvements. Word has gone forth from the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads

that these funds are frozen. Work on Utah's vehicle entry into Lake Powell recreation areas will suffer accordingly. Slowdowns on these projects is regrettable since they are long overdue, but fighting a prolonged Southeast Asia war, defeating domestic poverty and winning the race to the moon must obviously take a toll on such things as recreation access.

But the overall situation is not so urgent as to justify retrenchment in Highway Trust Fund expenditures. The fund and its administration are sound. In most states—certainly Utah—ample labor, equipment and a screaming need for essential roads exists to take advantage of available funds. The Highway Trust Fund was not intended for use as a tool to break Capitol Hill stalemates, and it should not be so abused.

[From the Deseret News, Oct. 12, 1967]

HIGHWAY CUTBACKS WOULD BE WRONG

The Johnson Administration's latest effort to resolve its impasse with Congress over the tax increase proposal versus spending cuts is worse than a heavy-handed attempt at arm-twisting. It's downright wastefulness.

The Administration, in casting about for means to cut spending, has asked state governors what a cutback in federal highway planning and building would do to their states' economies.

Governor Rampton has answered promptly that any cuts in Utah would hurt. With the economy of the state already in trouble because of the prolonged copper strike, a reduction in construction—a depressed industry itself for nearly two years—would be especially damaging.

Other governors have tabbed the idea "blackmail," "arm-twisting" and "dishonest."

In point of fact, the interstate highway program is financed through a self-supporting trust fund from fuel taxes, taxes on tires, oil, accessories, new trucks, buses and truck trailers. The fund does not come from congressional appropriation. Thus, cutbacks would have no effect on the anticipated \$29 billion federal budget deficit—or the case for a tax increase.

Moreover, to cut back highway construction now would be false economy. It would mean laying off engineers and other highly skilled workers who would have to be recruited again at a later date—very likely at increased costs.

Better economic sense would be to continue the highway building program at its present schedule, rather than to reduce it now and try to recoup later.

The cost of construction, high enough as it is, would be even higher should the program be cut back and then restored in a year or two. Since the end of World War II, construction costs have risen from four to six per cent a year.

In addition, there is the problem of lead time. On some phases of interstate construction, it takes as much as two years to plan, program, buy right-of-way, and finally build a highway. The proposal to cut highway construction by as much as 50 per cent could put the whole program back by years.

In short, there are simply so many things wrong with the cutback idea that it ought to be rejected out of hand. The Administration should look for economies in places where appropriations can actually be cut—and the highway program is not one of them.

GUIDELINES FOR A SENSIBLE SPENDING POLICY

Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. President, an excellent editorial in last Friday's Wall Street Journal gives another powerful indictment of current Government discount rate policies. According to the edi-

torial, more realistic discount rates are desirable so that "Congress might have a better idea as to which projects to reject and which to pursue in advance of others." Referring to present discount rates, the Journal editors see the interest rates "designed to fool the lawmakers with fancy figures."

This editorial affirms the opinion of the whole economics profession. In recent hearings of the Joint Economic Committee's Economy in Government Subcommittee, leading economists testified that private sector discount rates should be judged as the relevant rate also for public projects. Use of too low a rate can cause inflationary pressures and lower overall growth.

I urge Congress to demand that future proposals involving huge expenditures of Federal funds be analyzed through a series of alternative discount rates. By this method, Congress will better be able to judge which projects return positive benefits and, at the same time, Congress can rationally allocate budget outlays.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "Toward a Sensible Spending Policy" from the October 13, 1967, Wall Street Journal be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD A SENSIBLE SPENDING POLICY

While the Federal budget in general is obviously out of control, Congress claims to be keeping careful tabs on one major part of it: Public works. Even there, though, the lawmakers are bungling the job.

As Senator William Proxmire declared the other day, "this Congress is pouring out billions of dollars in a gross misallocation of our resources." The lawmakers, the Wisconsin Democrat said, insist "on stacking the deck, rigging the calculations in favor of the public works projects."

How is this done? According to the Senator, it's partly a matter of simply ignoring reality.

Any new public works project, such as a dam, will deliver its benefits over a period of years. Assuming that these benefits are real, some sort of monetary value can be placed on them. This value has to take into account not only what the benefits are but when they're received.

The benefits of the dam, of course, will be received only over a long period of time. Those that are expected only in the distant future aren't quite as valuable as those that come earlier; a dollar in the hand, after all, is worth more now than the dollar someone tells you you'll get a couple of decades later.

The value of the future benefits therefore is discounted. Unless the total of the dam's alleged benefits equals or exceeds the cost, Congress will not approve it.

For some reason, though, the future benefits are discounted at 3½%, supposedly the Treasury's long-term cost of money. Actually that level is unlikely to be attained at any time soon, if ever; the current rate is about 4½%. Merely substituting the true rate for the phony, notes Senator Proxmire, would "prevent the appropriation of billions of dollars."

The troubles of Congressional cost-benefit analysis, however, run a good deal deeper than that. To see why, let's look at the hypothetical Federal dam in another way.

To the extent that the dam's benefits, in the long run, do actually exceed its cost, the Government receives a "return" on its investment. By discounting future benefits at 3½%, Congress thus estimates an investment return of that size. Yet few private

businessmen would be interested in an investment that returned, before taxes, only 3½%—or even 4%.

When the Government takes money from the taxpayers and invests it at 3½%, it is cheating the economy out of a considerably higher rate of return and, in the process, wasting the nation's resources, if only because it costs the Treasury more than that to borrow the money. When an effort is made to assess Federal programs on a businesslike basis, therefore, Senator Proxmire believes the discount rate used should be businesslike, which would rule out a great many more Government projects.

Complete precision may well be impossible in cost-benefit analysis; a program's boosters, for one thing, will always be working hard to overstate its benefits. Yet what such analysis asks, in essence, is only whether a project will be worth its cost. That's a question that should be raised not only with public works but throughout Government.

If it were raised more often and answered more conscientiously, Congress might have a better idea as to which projects to reject and which to pursue in advance of others. However imperfect the guide, it would be more sensible than the present one, which seems to be designed to fool the lawmakers with fancy figures.

SENATE'S FAILURE TO RATIFY POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN CONVENTION IS INEXCUSABLE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the action of the Foreign Relations Committee in voting to table the Human Rights Convention on the Political Rights of Women continues to mystify me.

This convention which merely gives women the right to vote and hold office on an equal footing with men has already been ratified by over 50 nations. The rights established by this convention are already guaranteed to every American woman under our Constitution.

I urge the committee to reconsider its action of tabling this convention. Because I believe the statement of the National Council of Women of the United States will be of great interest and value to my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS, MARCH 8, 1967, WASHINGTON, D.C.

In 1965, at a symposium on "International Law and Human Rights" held in Washington, Elihu Lauterpacht, of Trinity College, Cambridge, England, said: "Human rights can be considered on two planes, the national and the international. One of the most interesting phenomena in the protection of human rights is the interconnection between national and international activity in the field. International consciousness of human rights has grown out of national awareness of the problem; and its turn, contemporary national concern with the situation in many parts of the world itself stems from the extent of such international awareness."

It is apparent that when the late President Kennedy, in July of 1963, asked the Senate to ratify three United Nations Conventions

he had much the same philosophy. In asking for ratification of the Convention on the Political Rights of Women; the Supplementary Convention on Slavery and the Forced Labor Convention the President said: "The fact that our Constitution already assures us these rights does not entitle us to stand aloof from documents which project our own heritage on an international scale. The day to day unfolding of events makes it ever clearer that our own welfare is interrelated with the rights and freedoms assured the people of other nations. The United States cannot afford to renounce responsibility of the very fundamentals which distinguish our government from all forms of tyranny."

The National Council of Women of the United States concurs, in deep convictions with these views. The purpose of the Council, founded in 1888 is to "serve the highest good of the family, the community and the state."

From its inception the Council included women of all races, creeds and traditions. Needless to say we have done all possible to promote these Conventions nationally. For example, in 1962 we sent a memorandum to all of our national affiliates on the implications of the Supplementary Convention on Slavery and on the estimated extent of its existence in the world of today.

Our National Council is an affiliate of the International Council which has affiliates in 60 countries, the list of which is appended hereto. A number of these countries are developing or newly emerging, having problems with which these three Conventions deal. We in the United States are only recently freed of the handicaps which face our sister countries. Not a half century has elapsed since women here have achieved their political rights. Peonage and debt bondage have been wiped out only within the life span of many of us.

The 19th Amendment to our Constitution secured the political rights of women. It has been pointed out that the Forced Labor Convention falls within the scope of the 13th Amendment. We ratified the 1926 Anti-Slavery Convention. Consistency requires that we should ratify these conventions under consideration.

Though my organization is sure that the majority of Americans abjure the practices which these treaties seek to eliminate, we are powerless to take deliberate measures to eliminate them elsewhere. Article 2 of the United Nations Charter specifically prohibits any nation from interfering with the internal affairs of other countries. However, there is the fact that we need not and should not sit back in the snug security of our own professed righteousness but should fulfill our moral obligation to the rest of the world by setting an example in ratifying these Conventions.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 498, S. 2171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

PRAYER DELIVERED BY RABBI SOL ROSENBERG

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on September 15, of this year, a testimonial dinner was held in my honor in Chicago—and, I might say, a very fruitful dinner, indeed.

A very distinguished rabbi from Van Nuys, Calif., came to deliver the invocation. His name is Sol Rosenberg, I have known him a long time. He uttered a very eloquent prayer.

I ask unanimous consent that this prayer be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER DELIVERED BY RABBI SOL ROSENBERG, OF VAN NUYS, CALIF., ON THE OCCASION OF THE TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR HON. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, INTERNATIONAL BALLROOM, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1967

Eternal our Father: Behold in blessing, we pray Thee, this happy gathering of Thy illustrious sons of the United States Senator from Illinois, Everett McKinley Dirksen.

Paraphrasing the popular verse in the Book of Ecclesiasticus, "Let us now praise a famous man."

In these troubled and uncertain times, Everett Dirksen does not sound an uncertain trumpet. His every utterance is a reveille a clarion call for action and commitment. He is a dramatic and effective reproach to the strident prophets of doom whose legions unhappily increase day after day.

A lover of God and obedient to God's word treasured in the sacred Bible, he is an eloquent tribune of the people and the public conscience and a faithful steward of the national ideals of our beloved land.

In the fullest meaning of the word, O Father, he is a Leader par excellence and as such, the public clamor does not so much command his mind as his tempered wisdom and his passion for right and justice and equity for all men. A great leader of his historic political party he does not kneel before blind partisan strife. If loyalty to his party is one of his rightful concerns, his paramount and abiding loyalty remains the well-being of the people and the trust of his office.

The Land of Lincoln has sent to the Capitol many distinguished sons and among her most honored names will remain the name of Everett McKinley Dirksen—a model of excellence, of dignity, of integrity and of courage.

Thy blessing, O Father is infinitely more than the praise of mortal flesh. We therefore commend to Thee, O God for Thy blessing our friend and our leader—Everett McKinley Dirksen. Grant him and his loved ones abundant good health and powers to sustain him in meeting the tests and trials of tomorrow to the end that the ceaseless struggle for man's freedom and dignity may enjoy the leadership and inspiration of Everett McKinley Dirksen for many more years to come.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HARRIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma.

WELFARE PROGRAMS NEED HUMAN TOUCH—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 400 AND 401

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Finance Committee is currently considering H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967. As a member of that committee who has been actively engaged in the consideration of this bill, and as a result of certain personal studies I have made, I am today submitting two amendments intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 12080.

I believe that our welfare programs can and must have more of the human touch.

In my recent travels to various parts of the United States and in personal conversations with those who are recipients of welfare programs, I find that there is great and growing hostility on the part of the poor against the effect and operation of many of these programs which are intended for their benefit.

There is a great and growing shortage of trained, professional social workers, the result being that harried, overworked social workers come to be regarded by many welfare recipients as persons who only enforce the law against the poor, rather than the friendly, helpful advisers they could and should be, working actively to assist recipients toward better lives and the realization of greater opportunities.

Moreover, unfortunately, I have found that there continues to be the lingering feeling in the minds of many people in this country that the poor should be punished for their poverty, and, therefore, are not entitled to the same treatment, quality of services and humane considerations that are extended to those who are not poor. Mr. President, I can say—and I have been poor—that being poor is punishment enough.

Mr. President, I submit my first amendment, intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 12080. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that it be printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 400) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 107, between lines 2 and 3, insert a new Section 201 and renumber succeeding sections, such new Section 201 to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. Section 2(a)(5), section 1002(a)(5), section 1402(a)(5), section 1602(a)(5), and section 1902(a)(4) of the Social Security Act (as amended by this Act) are amended by inserting 'A' immediately preceding the word 'provide' in each; and by adding at the end of each such section the following new language: 'and (B) provide for the training and effective use of paid subprofessional staff, with particular emphasis on the full-time or part-time employment of recipients and other persons of low income, as Community Service Aids, in the administration of the plan and for the use of nonpaid or partially paid volunteers in a Social Service Volunteer program in providing services to applicants and recipients and in assisting any advisory committees established by the State agency.'"

On page 110, between lines 16 and 17, insert a new subsection (2) and renumber succeeding subsections, such new subsection (2) to read as follows:

"(2) Section 402(a)(5) of such Act (as redesignated by section 202 (a) of this Act) is amended by inserting 'A' immediately preceding the word 'provide'; and by adding at the end thereof the following new language: 'and (B) provide for the training and effective use of paid subprofessional staff, with particular emphasis on the full-time or part-time employment of recipients and other persons of low income, as Community Service Aids, in the administration of the plan and for the use of nonpaid or partially paid volunteers in a social service volunteer program in providing services to applicants and recipients and in assisting any advisory committees established by the State agency.'"

On page 164, line 12, after the comma, insert the following new language: "except that such plan shall provide for the training and effective use of paid subprofessional staff with particular emphasis on the full-time or part-time employment of recipients and other persons of low income, as Community Service Aids, in the administration of the plan and for the use of nonpaid or partially paid volunteers in a social service volunteer program in providing services to applicants and recipients and in assisting any advisory committees established by the State agency."

On page 186, line 21, insert "A" immediately preceding the word "provides"; and on line 3, page 187, after the semicolon, insert the following new language: "and (B) provides for the training and effective use of paid subprofessional staff, with particular emphasis on the full-time or part-time employment of recipients and other persons of low income, as Community Service Aids, in the administration of the plan and for the use of nonpaid or partially paid volunteers in a Social Service Volunteer program in providing services to applicants and recipients and in assisting any advisory committees established by the State agency;"

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, this amendment requires that State public welfare agencies provide in their State plans, in regard to assistance and services for the aged, the blind, the disabled, and needy families, mothers, and children, for the effective use and training of paid subprofessional staff, with particular emphasis on the full-time or part-time employment of recipients and other persons of low income, as "Community Service Aids," and for the use of nonpaid or partially paid volunteers in a social service volunteer program in providing services to applicants and recipients and assisting any advisory committees established by such State agencies.

There are several and very important reasons why this amendment should be adopted.

First, a Task Force on Social Work Education and Manpower, which made its report a year ago, stated that we will need 100,000 additional social workers by 1970 if we are to meet just the needs of agencies whose work is related to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Moreover, President Johnson, in his message to Congress, cited the need for over 12,000 new professional social workers immediately.

To meet this growing need for trained, professional social workers, we have only 68 graduate schools of social work in the United States, conferring only about 3,500 such degrees a year. Undergraduate

programs in social work are in an even poorer position to meet the social work manpower needs which exist today.

Letters and telegrams, which I have received from Oklahoma and throughout the Nation, spell out the meaning of this shortage in terms of specifics. For instance, in Allegheny County, Pa., in 1966, 13 percent of the budgeted welfare positions requiring masters degrees in social work were vacant, and 20 percent were filled by those without full academic credentials. I am told that the situation in many sections of my home State of Oklahoma and throughout the Nation is even more acute.

Mr. President, because of this severe present and projected shortage in trained professional social workers, I strongly support the Social Work and Manpower Training Act, which has been incorporated into H.R. 12080, to authorize \$5 million for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years for grants to institutions of higher education having accredited programs in social work. This measure must be passed if we are to meet our dire shortage of social work manpower, and I believe it will be passed.

But, while we must continue to place our main emphasis in the administration of welfare programs on trained professional social workers, my amendment to H.R. 12080 would unlock a great, presently untapped source of additional workers—community service aids and social service volunteers. I am informed that as many as 40,000 subprofessionals will be needed by 1973 if we are to provide the manpower needed for present welfare programs related to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, there are also other and very compelling reasons why this amendment should be adopted, in addition to the fact that, unless we open the door to the use of community service aids and social service volunteers, we will never be able, fast enough, to open the manpower bottleneck in social work. The institution of these two new programs by State public welfare agencies would also have great effect, I believe, in further humanizing welfare services and in making them more responsive to the needs of the poor.

If the community service aid program is instituted in State welfare agencies, so that the poor, themselves, and those who would otherwise be on welfare could work side by side with and under the direction of trained professional social workers in programs for assistance and services to the aged, the blind, the disabled and needy families, mothers and children, these programs would be much more effective in helping such recipients toward better lives and widened opportunities.

It is intended that particular effort would be made to use men, not just women alone, as community service aids. It is intended, also, that these Community service aids would be recruited, primarily, from the poor and from those who would otherwise, except for their salaries under such programs, be recipients of welfare, to work in the communities in which they live. These people will be far better able to communicate with the welfare recipients, better able to ex-

plain public assistance and other community programs to them and better able to help those who administer State public welfare programs make such programs most effective and most helpful.

Mr. President, my wife and I recently visited Morgan School, in Washington, D.C., which is now beginning a very exciting 3-year experimental program, in cooperation with Antioch College, whereby the local community will have greater control over the policies and personnel. I was particularly impressed with the program recently instituted there whereby community residents have been employed as sub-professional teacher aids. The use of such teacher aids by and from the community, working with and under a professional teacher, has not only reduced the teacher-pupil ratio, which is very important, but also is proving to be very helpful in bringing about much-improved communication among the teachers, pupils and parents and a better awareness by the teachers of the special needs and problems of the children.

I believe that the community service aid program, established in the State public welfare agencies, would have the same kind of greatly needed effect in improving welfare programs and in helping to eliminate the rather bitter hostility and resentment which many welfare recipients feel toward those who administer such programs.

Additionally, and of equally great importance, is the fact that the community service aid program, when established in each of the States, would help put more income in the hands of the poor in a manner which would allow them a feeling of increased dignity and self-respect. They would not be performing busy work or make work. They would be performing real and much-needed service.

I feel, Mr. President, that this country cannot begin to meet the health, education, welfare and other social needs of our people in the years ahead unless we provide for greatly expanded use of subprofessionals. We have made a bare beginning in this respect in some areas, such as health and education. These beginnings must be expanded and the concept of subprofessional staff must be broadened, not only in the welfare system, as my amendment attempts to do, but in many other agencies as well, such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Public Health Service, the Employment Service, police systems, and others. In no other way will we be able to meet the manpower needs in these fields. In no other way can we help make these programs as responsive as they must be to the needs of the people they serve.

By so doing, as I have said, we would also allow poor people a greater opportunity for increased income, while doing useful work. As I have traveled about America, studying firsthand the problems of poverty, both rural and urban, I have seen or heard of no greater need than the need for jobs and better jobs. I am among those who support such measures as emergency employment and tax incentive for private jobs and training where the poor people are. My amendment, providing for community

service aids, would be a very important step in the same direction.

This amendment especially commends itself for adoption by the Senate, in that by filling some positions in welfare staffs with those who would otherwise, themselves, be recipients of welfare, we will be saving the amount of welfare payment against the total amount of the salary paid.

Mr. President, the poor are not ignorant and without skills. Many have much sensitivity, keen insights, valuable communication ability, and strong desire for productive, worthwhile work, all of which this country needs and must utilize.

Especially this session should this amendment be adopted, providing for community service aids, because of the fact that under H.R. 12080, as it will probably be reported by the Senate Finance Committee, we will be expanding the programs for day care centers and for family planning. The expansion of these programs is greatly needed and will place even further strains on already acute manpower shortages. My amendment would provide for the use of mothers now receiving aid to families with dependent children to be employed and trained, themselves, to help staff such day care centers under special professional guidance and direction and to help carry out the family planning program.

Lastly, the community service aid program would be one of hope and widened opportunity for many people who could work upward in the welfare staff positions and make such work their life work, their permanent careers, with their status and salaries increasing as their ability and experience increase.

In summary, the community service aid program offers an important and greatly needed avenue by which welfare services may be improved and thousands of the poor may be given real hope and widened opportunities and a chance to break out of the cycle of poverty.

The other part of my first amendment would institute in each of the welfare programs in each State the use of social service volunteers. This program, too, as I have indicated, could do much to relieve the strains of the welfare manpower shortage which our country faces. It would, also, as I have indicated, help to further humanize these welfare programs by bringing in contact with welfare recipients people who cared enough about them and their problems to give voluntarily of themselves.

Moreover, this volunteer program would start to fill a desperate need which exists in this country for middle-class people, personally, to know more about poor people, their living conditions, their problems, their needs and their desires. Too many of us, Mr. President, never see any poor people and have no awareness that they or their problems really exist. How easy it is for us, then, to callously dismiss any suggestions aimed at providing better lives and better opportunity for poor people on the grounds that all such suggestions are politically motivated or are visionary do good schemes.

But poverty is real, and so are poor

people. And, as American citizens become more aware of these real facts, which is difficult in these days of high-speed cars and expressways and ever-growing suburbs, their innate decency compels them to become involved and to support solutions to the problems of poverty.

The two greatest forces at work upon our society and upon all of us today are the desire that each of us has to have more control over the decisions which govern our lives and the desire for widened avenues to be of service to others. The community service aid program is designed to give poor people and welfare recipients a greater voice in the programs intended for their benefit, through the use of subprofessional staff in the administration of such programs and in assisting advisory committees established by State welfare agencies.

The social service volunteer program is designed to provide another and very important avenue for all American citizens, young and old, to give of themselves to others. There is no greater work in life than service to others. American citizens know this—it is the foundation of our country—and they will respond to widened opportunities for service to others, as VISTA, the Peace Corps, and other such programs so clearly show.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is already authorized by present law to allow Federal grants to States for public assistance programs to be used to help support volunteer services, either through 100 percent funding for demonstration projects or through 75 percent funding for a regular staff activity.

Where volunteer welfare programs have been instituted they have been wonderfully successful. In Cincinnati volunteers have become the men in the lives of several boys who otherwise would be largely without male influence as they grow toward manhood. Under this fine volunteer project, operating with the joint sponsorship of the Hamilton County Department of Public Welfare, the Cincinnati Union Bethel Neighborhood Center, the Cincinnati Boy's Club and the public schools of the area, 22 volunteers have each taken two boys, with whom they spend at least 2½ hours and one Saturday a month, as their proteges.

In St. Paul, Minn., the Ramsey County Welfare Department and the Girl Scouts Council have worked out a program by which Girl Scouts and Brownies visit elderly people in nursing homes and perform small but needed tasks, such as writing letters, reading, running errands, and doing many other appreciated things.

The Lane County Department of Public Welfare and the Lutheran Families Service Agency in Eugene, Oreg., using the volunteer services of a lawyer and a doctor, organized institutes whereby mothers who were receiving help from the aid to families with dependent children program can ask questions about medical and legal problems and join in the discussion, gaining not only knowledge but much self confidence by having their questions treated seriously by important people.

Here in the District of Columbia, the

Department of Public Welfare and the Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area in Junior Village have instituted a special speech therapy project, using volunteer speech therapists and other adults, for dependent and neglected children.

These programs, Mr. President, show some of the things which can be done. They indicate that American citizens will respond in a marvelous way if they are given an opportunity to help other people. These programs must be greatly expanded.

Idealism is not dead in this country; far from it, it is very much alive and growing. Young people, particularly, know that idealism is real and practical. Working in the Peace Corps and VISTA, many Americans are helping to prove more and more each day that idealism is the pragmatism of our age.

These beginning volunteer programs in public welfare agencies, VISTA, Peace Corps, SCORE in the Small Business Administration, and others, must be continued and encouraged, and similar programs must be instituted, not only the social service volunteer program, required by my amendment to be established by State public welfare agencies, but in many other programs as well.

It is intended that the Social Service Volunteer might be recruited and trained for a totally nonpaid task, or, like the VISTA and Peace Corps volunteer or Teacher Corpsman, might be recruited and trained for a particular period of partly compensated service, perhaps leading eventually to a social work or other career in a broad range of social concerns.

Mr. President, I now submit the second amendment to be proposed by me to H.R. 12080. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that it be printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 401) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 207, after line 21, insert a new section 405 to read as follows:

"Sec. 405. Title VII of the Social Security Act (as amended by this Act) is hereby amended by adding a new Section 707 at the end thereof, such new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 707. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make a study of and recommendations concerning the means by which and the extent to which the staff of State public welfare agencies may better serve, advise, and assist applicants for or recipients of assistance in securing the full protection of local, State, and Federal health, housing and related laws and in helping them make most effective use of public assistance and other programs in the community and the extent to which the State public assistance program may be used as a means of enforcing local, State, and Federal health, housing and related laws. The Secretary shall report the results of such study and make recommendations, including the necessary changes in the Social Security Act, to the Congress no later than July 1, 1968."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, this amendment directs the Secretary of

Health, Education, and Welfare to make a study of and recommendations concerning the means by which and the extent to which the staff of State public welfare agencies may better serve, advise, and assist applicants or recipients of assistance in securing the full protection of local, State, and Federal health, housing and related laws and in helping them make most effective use of public assistance and other programs available to them. Such study and recommendations of the Secretary would also include the extent to which the State public assistance programs may be used as a means of enforcing local, State, and Federal health, housing, and related laws.

Under the amendment, the Secretary would be required to report the results of such study and make his recommendations, including the necessary changes in the Social Security Act, to the Congress no later than July 1, 1968.

This amendment is complimentary to, though independent of, the first amendment I submitted. It, too, seeks to make the public welfare programs more effective and more responsive to the needs of the poor. Partly because of the example and activities of the Office of Economic Opportunity, but mainly because of the spirit which has pervaded the administration of President Johnson, as well as the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy, more and more Federal agencies and departments are commencing active, rather than passive, programs to carry out the duties assigned them. I believe our welfare programs can and should do more of the same.

Recently, when I was in East Harlem in New York City, I visited a small storefront youth office, first established with OEO summer funds. This project has recruited and organized young people in the area for community purposes. One of the activities of this group of young people is to help welfare recipients secure enforcement of the New York Social Services Law, which allows the welfare department to stop rent being paid a houseowner who is guilty of serious code violations in his rental housing. I visited one apartment, the occupant of which, a welfare recipient, is being assisted by this group of young men. She lives in unbelievably deplorable conditions. The ceiling in the bathroom had recently fallen, the toilet does not function, and there are numerous other code violations. Because these young men had searched out this lady, had advised her of her rights and had assisted her in claiming them, the terrible conditions in which she and her children had been living are being corrected.

Mr. President, I was very much impressed with the worthwhile work these young men have undertaken. But, I was immediately struck with a question of why this service to this welfare recipient had not long since been previously performed by the welfare worker who visits in her home regularly and who, therefore, must have been well aware of its code violations. I asked myself why the Federal Government should have to provide funds to a new group to bring about results intended by an existing program, the welfare program, which receives

great amounts of Federal funds also. Would it not be far more effective to help the welfare agency achieve these results which are clearly within its jurisdiction? Why cannot the welfare worker search out such people who have legal rights that are being transgressed? This actually would take no searching out, since welfare recipients are regularly and frequently visited in their homes by welfare workers. Why cannot the social worker advise welfare recipients of such legal rights? Why cannot the social worker assist such people in properly filing any such complaints?

Mr. President, I believe there is no reason why we cannot do a better job through the regular staff of State public welfare agencies of serving, advising, and assisting welfare recipients as to their rights under local, State, and Federal housing, health, and related laws. I believe there is no reason why we cannot do a better job through the regular staff of public welfare agencies in serving, advising, and assisting welfare recipients in making full use of existing welfare and other programs available to them in their community.

This second amendment will authorize and direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a study and come up with the recommendations to do exactly that.

Recently, also, I visited in the Bedford-Stuyvesant community of New York City. While there, as I have in many other parts of the country where poor people live, I found that some merchants take advantage of welfare recipients in the prices they charge and in the terms of credit they extend. For example, one grocery store in Bedford-Stuyvesant increases its grocery prices approximately 15 percent on each of the two times per month when welfare checks are delivered to local residents. Tied to the merchant by his extension of credit during the balance of each month, the individual welfare recipient doing business at that store is virtually powerless to do anything about this kind of exploitation.

I have seen areas in rural America where welfare recipients, clustered around a country store, are virtually in the old "company store" situation, and each month, with little knowledge of what they really owe for previous credit and unable to do anything about having to pay increased prices for what they buy, turn over their full checks to the store owner.

In another city of America, until some of the poor people got together and secured a lawyer to go with them as they paid their bills, a merchant was found to be keeping false records on the amounts owed him by welfare recipients, and, if he had not been made to render true charges, they would never in their lives have been able to get out of debt for the things they bought from him at inflated prices.

All over America the poor are becoming increasingly aware of this kind of exploitation, but, since they are mostly unorganized and powerless, such knowledge brings them not results, but frustration. In many areas, programs funded by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity are helping to rectify some of these conditions, and this is a great improvement.

But, Mr. President, once again, the question which occurs to me is: Why should the Federal Government be spending money in one program to make another, which it also funds, more effective? In other words, could not welfare agencies better advise their recipients on buying and on credit? Can they not actually help them enforce their rights? In some cities adjacent to military bases, there is no question that military people would be living in substandard housing or be subject to mistreatment by some few avaricious merchants, except for the pressure which the Military Establishment has long had the power and inclination to bring to bear on their behalf. Why cannot the same kind of service be performed by welfare agencies whose personnel are constantly in touch with virtually every aspect of the lives of the welfare recipients they serve?

These are some of the important questions which the study directed by my second amendment would seek to answer. The Secretary would look into these matters in a careful manner and make recommendations for legislative and other action required for their correction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished Senators from Michigan [Mr. HART] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], may be added as cosponsors of both these amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, throughout America public welfare agencies are overworked and understaffed and doing a difficult but commendable job. I do not mean to condemn them, but to help them. My amendments are intended to help public welfare agencies do a better, more pleasant, and more lastingly beneficial job for the people whom they serve and who are rightly entitled to our concern. I hope the amendments will be adopted.

THE IRON AND STEEL ORDERLY TRADE ACT OF 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRIFFIN in the chair). Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair now recognizes the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

Mr. HARTKE. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I introduce today, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and 34 fellow Senators, a bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products which is intended to maintain the viability of our vital steel industry.

This bill, I believe, is a moderate and reasonable approach for meeting a clear and well-documented need. Many of us have for some time recognized growing problems within this major industry. Last year many of my colleagues joined with me in providing that a complete study of steel imports be made under the auspices of the Finance Committee. That study is now available to the committee so that it can make the best possible judgment in this matter.

Mr. President, the Congress today is again faced with coming to grips with

the hard realities of the implications of a free trade policy. I certainly favor the ultimate achievement of free trade, we are all aware of the advantages that will accrue from it. I support the purposes of the Kennedy round. But while reductions in tariff may represent steps toward free trade, they are hardly the whole story. Tariffs are simply one of the most obvious and easily identifiable trade barriers. It is simply naive and unwise for us to pretend that we can ignore nontariff barriers. There are economic and political factors that can be and are structured in such a way as to prevent free trade. This is especially the case in world trade of steel, where most countries recognize how crucial steel production is to their economies and in particular to their national security. Our Government cannot continue to ignore these factors. We too must act in our national interest. I believe that with this bill we can act in a moderate way that gives a guarantee to our Nation that our steel industry will be kept viable and at the same time provide reasonable arrangements by which foreign steel producers may share in our market and its growth.

The Iron and Steel Orderly Trade Act of 1967, I will say again, can be described as a moderate quota bill. It limits imports in any year to 9.6 percent of recent consumption, the average amount of steel consumed in the United States during the 3 years preceding each quota year. Product and country of origin limitations also apply based upon their percentage share of total imports during the 3-year base period.

These limitations are to be established by agreement negotiated by the President with supplying nations. Imports from any nation which does not enter such an agreement will be limited to a percentage of recent consumption equal to the percentage of consumption supplied by that nation during a longer base period 1959-66.

The quota program will be administered by the Secretary of Commerce. He is empowered to remedy any local injury caused by a shift in geographic import patterns. He is also directed to review the program after quotas have been in effect for 5 years, and recommend to Congress the continuation, modification or termination of quota relief. Thus, under the terms of this bill imports may continue to take almost 10 percent of the domestic market for iron and steel mill products.

Those with reservations about supporting such a bill as this may ask why it is necessary. I would respond by saying that the evidence is now clear that steel import quotas reasonably fitted to the overall needs of both foreign and domestic manufacturers are required in the broad public interest. Without them, we can expect a steady weakening of the domestic steel industry and, thus, a growing threat to our national security.

Consider these facts for the moment: In the past 10 years exports of steel mill products have dropped from 5.3 million tons annually to 1.7 million tons, while imports have gone from just over 1 million tons to about 11 million tons. That

is a net change of over 13 million tons of steel, and this year imports are higher than ever.

In the first 8 months of 1967, imports were even larger than in the corresponding period of 1966, whereas the domestic market was considerably smaller. From 1957 to 1966 apparent consumption of steel mill products in the United States rose from 76 million to 99 million tons. During the same period, shipments by our steel industry rose from 80 million to 90 million tons and exports dropped from 5 million to less than 2 million tons. A 30-percent consumption increase with a production increase of only 13 percent indicates a serious problem in the industry.

The problem is caused by cheap imports. In 1957, steel imports were 1.5 percent of United States apparent consumption. In the 10 years since 1957 we have seen imports multiply about tenfold, while consumption has increased by less than one-third, and exports have declined by nearly two-thirds. Eleven million tons of offshore steel entered this country last year, to claim 10.9 percent of our domestic steel market, and so far this year, as we have seen, imports are running about 11.6 percent of domestic apparent consumption. Steel imports last year were valued at almost \$1 billion.

Ten years ago imports were concentrated in products involving relatively simple technology. Since that time, however, expansion of foreign steel mill facilities has been heavily concentrated in highly sophisticated sheet mills. Market penetration in hot and cold rolled sheet has increased alarmingly in the last 5 years, particularly in certain specialty steel categories. Imports of cold rolled stainless steel sheet, for example, which accounted for only 5.7 percent of the American market in 1962, had shot up to 20.6 percent of the market by 1966.

While the penetration of the U.S. market varies by product or region, no important steel product line or market area is immune to the impact of imports. The installation of large-scale and ultra-modern equipment by European and Japanese producers has enabled them to compete with similar equipment here and to ship large quantities of the most sophisticated steel products to this country. Cheap water transportation permits them to invade not only coastal markets but also the industrial heartland of the United States. Although almost 20 percent of the market has been taken by imports on the west coast in recent years, the greatest increase in imports has occurred in the midwest, the largest of our markets for steel.

Not everyone shares the view that the American steel industry should temporarily receive special assistance. The reason of course is that steel must survive as an essential component or building block of the national economy.

Steel is important to the country. Its major uses—automobiles, construction, containers, machinery, appliances—all catalog our industrial strength. Although much military hardware today consists of materials other than steel, all of it includes some vital steel components for which there are no practical

substitutes. A simple economy or one in the early stages of development can safely depend upon significant external sources for its steel requirements. But every advanced economy needs steel in amounts and types too large and varied to be supplied in significant tonnages by others, particularly in case of national emergency. Realization of this basic requirement has been behind the continuing drive by the Soviet Union to build up its steel industry regardless of cost.

The continued growth of imports at only half the rate experienced during the 5-year period 1961-66, would produce a situation within 10 years in which the United States is dependent on foreign sources for a staggering 40 million tons of steel. Consider the effect on the country if these imports were to be shut off in a national emergency. In fact our limited war planning envisions the shutoff of such noncontiguous sources of supply. President Johnson has aptly described steel as "basic to our economy and essential to our security—increasingly important to us in the years ahead." Because steel is essential to our security, we must provide for equitable terms of world steel trade, which the industry requires to keep itself healthy and the Nation strong.

Steel imports are shrinking employment opportunities in the steel industry. About 6,400 people are now employed in our steel plants for every million tons of finished products shipped in a year. An additional 1,300 persons are involved in coal and ore mining and transportation. Thus every million tons of domestic steel mill products shipped means employment for approximately 7,700 Americans.

Accordingly, 11 million tons of steel imports sold in this country in 1966 represent the export of some 69,000 jobs in the basic steel industry and 14,000 jobs in supporting activities—a total of over 83,000 jobs that have gone abroad. From another point of view, imports of steel mill products in 1966 were roughly equal to the combined annual shipments of Republic Steel, our third largest steel producer, and Youngstown Sheet & Tube, our eighth largest. These two companies together employed some 80,000 people in 1966.

Because of these factors, the United Steelworkers of America representing 550,000 iron and steel workers in this country have endorsed the bill.

The most important factor which contributes to our import problem is the wage differential. Our steelworkers earned an average of \$4.63 per hour last year, including fringe benefits. In the European coal and steel community the average wage in the steel industry was equivalent to \$1.75 an hour and in Japan the average was just over \$1. While we probably have the most efficient and productive workers in the world, our steelworkers are not four times as productive as the Japanese steel industry with their new plants and equipment. The low wage rates abroad give the foreign manufacturers an unbeatable advantage—the only real advantage they have over our steelmakers. Our industry turns out steels that are just as good as those produced abroad, or better. Our steel plants are

located at least 3,000 miles closer to their customers, and can quote delivery times and offer services which foreign producers cannot begin to match. No language barriers and no collection difficulties beset domestic mills selling to domestic customers. And yet an ever-increasing share of our domestic market is claimed by foreign producers, with all their disadvantages. The reason for this is perfectly clear. Offshore steel sold in this country averages 20 percent cheaper than the comparable domestic grades.

As for reducing prices, we have only to look at the dire straits to which price alignment has brought the European steel industry to realize the folly of that course. Moreover, it would be impossible for us to cut prices enough to do any good. The 20-percent average price differential between domestic and imported steel came to about \$34 per ton in 1966. The U.S. industry average profit before taxes in that year was less than \$17 per ton. To attack a \$34 price advantage with a \$17 gross profit would be foolhardy.

According to estimates by the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—world steelmaking capacity outside the United States rose by 254 million net tons between 1955 and 1966, while production—or demand—increased by 205 million. From a balanced supply-demand condition at the beginning of that period, capacity of other steel producing nations now exceeds demand by more than 55 million net tons.

The European industries, which had expanded rapidly to rebuild war-damaged economies and which were continuing to expand in anticipation of rising demand at home and abroad found themselves after the mid-1950's with substantially more capacity than demand. This led foreign producers to think they could solve their problem by increasing their exports. But the result has been that the European producers are now in serious financial trouble, because their efforts have led to unprofitably low prices at home as well as abroad. We cannot afford to have that happen to our domestic industry.

Japan is a special case. The Japanese steel industry—like those in many other nations—is clearly an instrument of national policy as to international trade and, as such, is heavily favored in terms of capital supply, which adds to its advantage in unit labor costs. The Japanese industry is also insulated from steel imports. Present expansion plans, if carried out, would mean that by 1975 Japanese exports might total 25 to 30 million tons of shipments and constitute 40 to 50 percent of all world trade in steel, other than trade within the European Common Market.

Government determination in other countries to maintain viable domestic steel industries make it probable that outlets for most of this vast increase could be found only in the United States. But an increase in U.S. imports from Japan on that scale would mean that the Japanese had taken all the growth in steel consumption in this country.

I think that statement bears repeating. In other words if the Japanese fol-

low their procedures, they will take every bit of growth and consumption, and there will be no room for growth and expansion whatsoever in the American market. Needless to say, this would have a disastrous effect on the U.S. steel industry, and we cannot permit that to happen.

I might point out that the entire deficit in our balance of payments, amounting to about \$1.4 billion, represents almost the amount of the trade deficit with respect to steel, which in 1966 was almost \$1 billion.

Thus none of us in Government can hold ourselves aloof from the trade problem of the steel industry because it is a national problem. The plain fact is that we need some regulation of steel imports. We do not object to sharing our market and its growth with foreign producers on a sensible basis. This bill provides for just that. If the domestic market grows, imports increase. But we strongly object to the prospect of imports taking an intolerable share of the U.S. steel market.

Present conditions including wage disparities and Government policies do not permit competition among the steel producers of the free world on a comparatively equal basis. The theory of comparative advantage in world trade does not apply to steel. Hence, Government's policy which ignores the special situation of world steel trade ultimately means a decline in strength and efficiency of the steel industry in this country and increasing reliance on steel sources thousands of miles away.

If this were a world of free trade, if no other nation had any tariff or non-tariff barriers to protect their domestic industry nor gave it any assistance to help penetrate nondomestic markets, if this were a world in which there was no longer any nationalism, no concern for national security and strength, and no need for such concern; in short, if we had but one world, one economy, one currency, and no balance of trade or balance of payment problems, then it might be appropriate for the free trade theorists and defenders to argue that no industry, no company, no locality should be provided any protection whatsoever by governmental action.

All of us know only too well, however, that this does not describe the trade world of today. Since it does not, it is not wise for us in the United States to conduct our affairs as though it were true.

The Government must recognize the seriousness of the import problem and the danger it presents to the future security of the United States.

A means must be developed to arrest the growing penetration of the U.S. market to prevent the domestic industry from being seriously weakened and to discourage excessive expansion of steel industries in other countries. The quota bill I have introduced today provides this means.

Promptness in taking actions along these lines is of vital importance. The longer we wait to solve the steel import problem, the more difficult solutions become. And the more difficult the solutions, the greater is the danger of dis-

rupting the economies of other countries when they are found and applied.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with a list of the names of cosponsors, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, in accordance with the request of the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 2537) to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2537

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this "Act may be cited as the "Iron and Steel Orderly Trade Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that increased imports of pig iron and steel mill products have adversely affected the United States balance of payments, contributed substantially to reduced employment opportunities for United States workers in the domestic iron and steel industry, and captured such an increasing share of the market for pig iron and steel mill products in the United States as to threaten the soundness of the domestic iron and steel industry and therefore the national security.

It is, therefore, declared to be the policy of the Congress that access to the United States market for foreign-produced pig iron and steel mill products should be on an equitable basis to insure orderly trade in pig iron and steel mill products, alleviate United States balance of payments problems, provide an opportunity for a strong and expanding United States iron and steel industry, and prevent further disruption of United States markets and unemployment of United States iron and steel workers.

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "category" means a seven digit item number which appears in the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (1965) published by the United States Tariff Commission as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act and which is—

(A) Within the range beginning with item 608.1500 and ending with item 610.5260 (except that an item within such range which is specified in section 7 shall be included in the term "category" only as provided in such section 7); or

(B) One of the following item numbers:

607.1500	642.9100	646.2640
607.1800	642.9600	690.2500
642.0200	642.9700	690.3000
642.3500	646.2500	
642.9000	646.2620	

(2) The term "imports" refers to United States imports in any category or categories within the meaning of paragraph (1).

(3) The term "consumption" means, with respect to any category or with respect to all categories, the sum of United States mill

shipments plus imports minus United States exports.

(4) The term "year" means calendar year.

SEC. 4. The President may, after consultation with all nations having an interest in supplying pig iron and steel mill products to the United States, negotiate multilateral or bilateral agreements establishing, for periods beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, annual quantitative limitations on United States imports of such products subject to the following provisions:

(1) Total imports for each year shall not exceed an amount determined by applying to the average annual consumption during the three years immediately preceding the year in which the limitation is to be effective a percentage equal to the percentage of average annual consumption represented by imports during the years 1964 through 1966, inclusive.

(2) The percentage of total imports in any year represented by imports in a particular category shall not exceed the percentage of total imports during the years 1964 through 1966, inclusive, represented by imports in that category.

(3) The percentage of total imports in any year represented by imports from a particular nation shall not exceed the percentage of total imports during the years 1964 through 1966, inclusive, represented by imports from that nation.

SEC. 5. For periods after the 180th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall, within the overall limits set forth in paragraph (2) of Section 4, by proclamation restrict annual imports from each nation which is at any time on or after such 180th day not a party to an agreement then limiting current imports negotiated pursuant to Section 4 to an amount determined by applying the percentage of consumption represented by imports from that nation during the years 1959 through 1966, inclusive, to the average annual consumption during the three years immediately preceding the year in which the restriction is to apply.

SEC. 6. Within the overall limitations imposed under section 4, the President may adjust the share of United States imports in any category which may be supplied by any nation. In making this adjustment the President shall be guided principally by historical import patterns, but may modify such patterns to accommodate interests of developing nations or other changing conditions of international trade.

SEC. 7. If imports in any year in any of the following item numbers appearing in the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (1965) published by the United States Tariff Commission as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act reach 120 per centum of imports in that item number during the year immediately prior to the year in which this Act is enacted, then such item number shall be considered a category under paragraph (1) of section 3, and this Act shall take effect with respect to such category on the first day of January following the year in which the 120 per centum level was reached:

608.1000	642.1020	646.5400
608.2500	642.1040	646.5600
608.2700	642.1200	652.9000
609.1200	642.1400	652.9200
609.1300	642.1620	652.9400
609.1500	642.1800	652.9500
609.8400	642.8000	652.9600
609.8600	642.9300	653.0200
609.8800	646.2000	653.0300
609.9000	646.2700	680.4000
610.8020	646.2800	688.3000
610.8040	646.3000	688.3500
642.0800	646.4000	688.4000

SEC. 8. (1) the amount of imports in any category in either half of any year shall not exceed 60 per centum of the total permissible

amount of imports in that category for that year.

(2) Should any limitation imposed under this Act take effect on any day other than January 1 of a year, such limitation shall apply to pro rata during the remaining portion of such year.

SEC. 9. (1) Import limitations established under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary may issue such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(2) Whenever the Secretary of Commerce determines it to be necessary to avoid disruption of regional markets, he shall provide by regulation that the proportionate share of total imports and imports in any category from any nation entering through any port of entry in or near such regional markets shall not exceed the proportionate share of such imports entering through such port during the applicable base period. The Secretary shall conduct the review required to make such a determination at least annually.

(3) Upon the expiration of 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a report to the Congress as to the effects of the import limitations established under this Act on (1) the economic soundness of the iron and steel industry and employment opportunities in such industry, (2) the general economy, (3) the United States balance of payments, and (4) the national security, together with his recommendations as to whether such import limitations should be continued, modified, or revoked. Before making such report, the Secretary shall conduct a hearing at which all interested parties shall have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Indiana for his very able presentation of a matter that I think is of great importance to the entire country; and I should like to make some observations in line with what he has said, to express my own concern.

Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to comment on the steel imports bill of which I am a cosponsor.

It seems to me that we are not paying enough attention to one important fact in the current discussion of steel imports. That fact is: There is no such thing as true free trade in the world steel market today.

On the contrary, trade in steel is anything but free. It is heavily weighted in favor of producers outside the United States. In other countries, steelmakers are given considerable help by their governments in efforts to export their products. They also enjoy substantial advantages in cost, largely because they do not have to pay high wages to steelworkers. In some of these countries, production is regulated by custom or decree, so that steel is manufactured even when there is no home demand. This has re-

sulted in the output of more steel throughout the world than the world really needs. This excess must either be allowed to accumulate or be placed somewhere. That "somewhere" is usually the United States.

In short, Mr. President, there are certain rules for the game of free trade. And those rules are not being followed in many countries.

In the United States, however, the rules of free trade are still being used, in an heroic but futile gesture. Now if this were pure sport, we might excuse ourselves on the ground that in games, it is not who won or lost that counts, but how the game was played. But steel trade is not pure sport. There is more than the scores at stake. Our entire economy is affected by the outcome.

Since the 1930's the United States has pursued policies designed to encourage freedom in international trade. Many Members of the Congress are still in favor of free trade—true free trade. But in the case of steel, being in favor of free trade does not make one in favor of the status quo, because steel trade today is not free.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming such time as he may require.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Indiana place a time limitation on his request?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming may proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HANSEN. Ideally, in a free trade situation, each country would specialize in products in which it had a "comparative advantage." Each country would sell in the world market those items which it could produce with the greatest relative efficiency. More simply, each would do what it could do best.

Unfortunately, that theory is not put into practice in many countries abroad. Steel is produced regardless of an inability to produce it efficiently. There is a standing joke, to the effect that every emerging nation wants three prestige items, whether or not they are practical: A flag, an airline, and a steel mill. Behind the humor lies truth. And the truth is, that instead of doing what they could do best, too many nations are contributing to an ever worsening trade problem—excess world steel production.

How can this foreign steel be sold at such low prices if it is not produced efficiently? There are several answers to that, but the main one is: Through subsidies or other help from their governments.

Ironically, many of these governments espouse free trade outwardly and are quick to cry "foul" if some other state fails to play by the rules. They feel that their national interests come first, even at the expense of stated free trade principles. They believe these national interests can best be served by the pres-

ervation of a strong steel industry. And they try to keep that industry solvent and able to compete effectively through a wide variety of financial and other aids.

The intervention of the Germany Ministry of Finance on behalf of the Krupp enterprises in their recent money crisis illustrates one type of help being given. Operations of such agencies as the Japanese Industrial Structure Council and Ministry of International Trade and Industry illustrate another kind of aid.

In Great Britain, Sweden, and the European Community, government ownership of raw material sources can work to the advantage of their steel industries.

Most industrialized countries, with the notable exception of the United States, take a permissive, if not an encouraging, attitude toward steel cartels. The recent establishment of four sales organizations embracing all West German steel producers is a case in point.

The degree of cartelization among steel-producing nations varies considerably. In Japan, it is so widespread, vertically and horizontally, that actual relationships between companies, and between industry and government, are difficult to define. In 1966 there were 17 cartels and similar agreements in basic steel alone. If we add to this extensive overlapping control exercised by trading companies and associated banks of Japan, we see a picture that conforms only slightly to our conception of competition.

I do not propose to try to enumerate all of the ways and means by which foreign governments aid their steel industries, and thus prevent true free trade. The list is seemingly endless.

But the situation in which the United States finds itself in world steel trade today is apparent. And one truth stands out: Natural advantages have become largely irrelevant because of the determination by most other governments to provide artificial advantages.

Most regrettably, there is no indication, no evidence at all, that conditions will change, that governments will begin to practice what they preach about free trade.

The major question, then, facing both the U.S. Government and its steel industry is: What shall we do about this increasing disadvantage we suffer in world trade?

For domestic steel makers, the answer is clear. Our industry must seek new and better ways of producing the highest quality steel at the lowest possible cost. And it is doing just that. Our home steel companies are spending money for research and development at an annual rate above \$150 million. And their investments in equipment and facilities are running at more than \$2 billion a year. Even in our inflated era, these are still huge sums.

Examples of the domestic industry's effort to improve its competitive position can be found in my own State in Wyoming. Both Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., and the United States Steel Corp., have substantial iron ore operations there—operations representing many millions

of dollars and many hundreds of jobs for Wyoming workers.

To illustrate the relationship of steel and Wyoming, we can look to United Steel's Atlantic City ore operations near Lander. These are no ordinary facilities. The raw material mined in the area is of low grade, a magnetic taconite, and it would not be usable for steel production if American know-how and ingenuity had not found a way to improve its quality. Such a way was found, and the result is one of the most technologically advanced iron ore mining and beneficiating operations ever devised.

Since 1962, improved ore from Atlantic City has been rolling steadily out of Wyoming for Utah furnaces, where it is turned into steel to compete in our west coast markets against mounting shipments from Japan.

In the Mountain States, we know that our efforts in iron and steel must be at maximum efficiency if we are to remain in business. We must be flawless if we hope to compensate, even in part, for our geographic and other disadvantages, most of which stem from the Japanese Government's aid to exports and the extremely low wages paid to Japanese steelworkers. So far, our efforts have enabled us merely to stay in the fight. We are not winning. No matter how hard we try, no matter how many months we go without a single production mistake, no matter how rapidly we advance in technology, we still wage an uphill struggle just to survive.

Our activity in Wyoming is but a small part of the iron and steel story in the United States. But to the people of Wyoming, success in the effort is vital to our economic well-being.

In 1965 alone, foreign steel imports to the west coast completely erased a potential for 1,500 jobs in Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado. And that job figure is getting higher each passing year. We have not begun to arrest the trend, much less to turn it around.

What, then, is the answer? Shall our Government stand by and watch our domestic steel industry play the game of free trade against teams that have tossed aside the rule book? Can we, as a nation, afford to risk losing the game?

The answer should be a resounding "No." First, our Government must recognize the seriousness of this import problem and attempt to establish equilibrium in steel trading by halting penetration of home markets. Second, it must seek some way of bringing true freedom to the trade.

Our domestic industry has asked its Government to take that first step. It is not a giant step, but it will help.

American steel producers know they could compete in a free market, and they would welcome the opportunity. But, being realistic, they know this freedom may not arrive for some time, if ever.

In the meantime, all they are saying to their Government is this: Give us an equalizer, so we can compete. If steel trade cannot be free, let it at least be fair.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming is one of the finest made on this subject and demonstrates the need we have at this time to take some affirma-

tive action. I believe both of us would like to repeat at this time that at stake in the free world is free and fair trade, and central to that is fair trade. What we have proposed is a fair chance for American labor and American steel producers in international trade.

Americans do not enjoy any international cartels such as foreign companies do. We do not have market allocations as foreign companies do. We do not have a dual interest rate system and the advantage of a central bank or subsidies from foreign investments. Our industry has no national advantage of any kind other than what is in the bill. A free industry such as ours can never compete equitably with the subsidized industry of another nation.

The answer might lie in higher tariffs, but I do not advocate this, because it would be a blow to free trade, and we advocate free trade coupled with fairness in trade.

Perhaps another answer to subsidized foreign competition, to cartels and allocations is relief to our local industry from our antitrust laws. But that again is a long way around. The most direct route to fair trade is to establish quotas with which all the world can live—quotas which provide that foreign competitors may share in the growth of the U.S. market without undermining our steel industry in the process.

At the heart of the price discrepancy is the wide difference between the American standard of living and those of other steel nations. The wage differential which supports our standard of living is best exemplified by these facts: Our steelworkers earn an average of \$4.63 an hour, including fringe benefits. In the European Coal and Steel Community, this equates to \$1.75 an hour, and in Japan to between \$1 and \$1.10.

As cheaper foreign steel floods our market, we find that our principal export becomes jobs. The amount of steel tonnage imports last year alone represents a loss of 83,000 jobs in this country.

I should like to make one fact clear: I am not a protectionist, and this is not a protectionist bill. The intent of the bill is to preserve our steel industry as essential to national security and to the national interest.

I might say to those people who are critical of this approach, let them criticize, and they will drive this country to what they say they do not want most. The critics of this measure will force this country into such a position that the only course will be to abandon the free trade concept.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In keeping with the wishes of the acting majority leader, I ask for a 5-minute limitation.

THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the copper strike is more than 3 months old. We hear a great deal about the month-old strike in the auto industry but very little about the copper strike, now beyond its 90th day. The copper strike, however, is of similarly major consequences, involving the States of Montana, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, and New Mexico, as well as fabricating plants on the west coast, in the Midwest, in the South, and on the east coast, especially in upper New Jersey and the Connecticut Valley.

On October 3, I addressed a letter to the President of the United States, asking him to see what could be done about bringing the copper strike to a head. I also made a statement on the floor of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the statement I made on the floor of the Senate be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COPPER STRIKE

OCTOBER 3, 1967.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. PRESIDENT: As you are well aware, the strike in the domestic copper industry has now been in effect for more than eighty days. There seems to be no end in sight at the moment nor does there seem to be a real desire on the part of the contending parties to get together and operate under the free collective bargaining process.

I am enclosing for your consideration a copy of a statement which I will make on the floor today and, at the same time, I am asking you to appoint a study committee to assess the effects of the copper strike on the national defense effort. I realize that you do not have any effective means at your disposal to cope with this situation except the Taft-Hartley Act and I do not think it would be effective at this time in bringing this matter to a head. Therefore, I would appreciate your looking into other available means by which the companies and the unions could be brought together to the end that this strike, which has caused an estimated loss of 342 thousand tons to date, can be brought to a head.

It is my understanding that supplies of copper at this time appear to be sufficient to last at least through October. But it is also my understanding that the copper fabricators, having disposed of the 38-cent-price set aside for copper, have now raised their prices between 43¢ and 44¢ a pound. The current strike in the red metal industry is of the greatest and most immediate moment to my State of Montana as well as to other copper producing states of the west, and it is my belief that if some solution is not found, that, shortly, it will become a national problem.

With best wishes, I am,
Respectfully yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD,
OCTOBER 3, 1967

Mr. President, we are approaching the 80 day mark in the major work stoppage in the copper mining industry. It has been apparent for some time that there is evidently no real desire on the part of the unions or the management involved to get together to bargain in good faith and to reach an agreement which might bring this situation to an end. In this respect both labor and management are at fault because up to this time

both of them are not even paying lip service to the free collective bargaining process.

Both labor and management ought to, even at this late date, get down to hard discussions about ways and means by which this strike could be settled. At the instigation of various members of the Senate from copper producing States, Secretaries Wirtz and Trowbridge did call to Washington representatives of unions and companies during the first part of September. There was no progress reached toward a settlement at that time and following this meeting both Secretary Trowbridge and Secretary Wirtz stated that the situation was hopeless.

I do not agree. I think we ought to give consideration to the miner and the smelterman who is out on strike, because his purchasing power is being diminished. The many needs to look after his family and his obligations are not being met. Many of these people are seeking part time or other forms of labor in other fields. Many members of the craft unions in Butte, Anaconda, Great Falls, and elsewhere are moving to other parts of the nation to find employment. The States effected are losing revenue at an alarming rate.

I am today requesting the President to appoint a study committee to assess the effects of the strike on the national defense effort. I am also requesting him to look into all the available means at his disposal to bring this matter to a head. I am hopeful that he and his advisors can come up with the means to cope with this long drawn-out strike to which there is no end in sight. But, in all candor, the only authority I know of that the President has is the invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Frankly, I do not think that the Taft-Hartley is the answer, because it would cover only a period of 80 days and then if no settlement were reached the strike might well begin again in the middle of the winter when conditions would be worse for the miner and the smelterman and their families. I am not at all certain that legislation similar to that which now covers the railroad shop crafts difficulty would be the answer either. I do believe, however, that if collective bargaining in good faith is not undertaken in the immediate future by the companies and the unions that other ways and means will have to be considered in the interest of the economies of the States effected by the strike as well as the nation as a whole.

May I say that I deplore the trend toward government intervention in these matters—a trend encouraged by both labor and management—because it degrades the principal of free collective bargaining and it places in the hands of the central government powers it should not have and does not want.

I, therefore, request the unions and the companies involved to meet on this matter and I would hope that consideration would be given to the possibility in Montana of the Anaconda Company and the leaders of the unions getting together to discuss the matter as it affects my State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on October 6—that is, a week ago Friday—as a result of this statement, I received a telephone call from Mr. Joseph Molony, vice president of the United States Steel Workers, and Al Skinner, international representative of the same organization. They asked if it would be possible for them to come to Washington and to meet with Senator METCALF and me. We were delighted to have this opportunity to discuss the strike situation in the copper industry with Messrs. Molony and Skinner. We found them most cooperative and understanding and also, we thought, not too inflexible.

Then, as a result of the letter to the President, on October 9—a week ago to-

day—and at the President's suggestion, Senator METCALF and I met with Secretary of Defense McNamara and Secretary of Labor Wirtz. Also present was Mr. Walter A. Hamilton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce, representing Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge, who had been called to a meeting before a congressional committee.

That meeting was similarly most significant. We were able to get the viewpoint of the Government on the strike in the copper industry from the standpoint of national security, the possible release of copper from the stockpile, and the potential invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

On Wednesday, October 11—last week—it was our privilege to meet with Mr. Charles Brinckerhoff, chairman of the board of the Anaconda Co. He, likewise, indicated an intense interest and his attitude did not seem too inflexible.

As the result of these three meetings, I think it safe to say that all parties indicated a genuine interest in trying to get down to negotiations, to the end that the copper strike could be brought to a conclusion.

Speaking for myself, I was pleased that Governor Babcock called a meeting of the unions and the Anaconda officials in Butte on October 10, and I am happy to note that the unions and the Anaconda officials will meet in Butte on Tuesday, October 17—tomorrow.

It is my hope that this meeting will be the takeoff to serious negotiations between Anaconda and the unions; that it would not be just for the purpose of getting together and indicating that both sides are willing to sit down. Moreover, I hope that after this first meeting tomorrow, further meetings could be held, not in a week or so, but on a day-to-day basis. If need be, perhaps, meetings between the two parties could be arranged on a round-the-clock basis with mediation and conciliation service representatives acting as go-betweens. In this way, it might be possible for the parties to get down to hard collective bargaining, as was intended when the negotiations were first underway.

It is my belief that more than 3 months have been wasted up to this time; meaning a tremendous decline in income for the people out of work as well as for the State of Montana.

It is my further belief that the Government does not intend to invoke Taft-Hartley. Speaking personally again, I would hope it would not do so. The invocation of Taft-Hartley now could very well bring about a resumption of the strike 80 days hence—right in the middle of the winter—if no settlement was achieved. That would make the situation worse than ever.

As the Secretaries indicated, national security is not involved, nor is there any intention on the part of the Government to release any copper from the stockpiles. Therefore, the responsibility rests on the shoulders of the union and the company to get together; and the only way that could be done, in my opinion, is by a continuous meeting, on a give-and-take basis, joined in fully by all concerned. It would be my further hope that if this were done, the present im-

passe might be broken, and perhaps a basis for agreement could be arrived at.

The Government will not, in my opinion, intervene in any way at this time. Therefore, with winter coming on, with incomes declining considerably, with needs becoming more apparent, it is necessary that in good faith all parties concerned get to the table, stay there, and continue negotiations, to the end that an agreement can be reached.

Mr. President, Senator METCALF and I had the opportunity, over the past weekend, to visit Great Falls, Helena, Butte, and Anaconda, and observed the effects of the strike on the people in those areas. As one who spent some 9 years of his life in the copper mines, I am well aware of the ups and downs which have afflicted that segment of our economy, and it bodes no good for the people whom we represent in our State to have this strike continue.

So both Senator METCALF and I felt that when the Anaconda officials and the United States Steel Workers Union officials start their meetings in Butte tomorrow it will be just the kickoff to a continual round of meetings to the end that a settlement can be arrived at.

But there are two things I want to make clear: First, there is no intention on the part of the Government to intervene, no invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act, no release of copper from the stockpile, no national emergency; second, it is up to the unions and the companies to get together and work out an agreement on a free collective bargaining basis. This is as it should be and as it must be, because the Government inherently and basically really has no part to play in these difficulties between labor and management, although at times it has been called upon through legislation and other means to inject itself into situations in which it—and the parties concerned—would have been better off if it had stayed out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandums of the meetings in Montana with the three groups I mentioned be set forth as a part of the RECORD so that all concerned will be aware of the position and the roles played by the Senators from Montana in attempting to bring an end to the strike situation as it affects Montana.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETING WITH SENATORS MANSFIELD AND METCALF AND JOSEPH MOLONY, VICE PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES STEEL WORKERS, AND AL SKINNER, NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF UNITED STATES STEEL WORKERS, OCTOBER 6, 1967

At the Salt Lake meeting on October 2, Messrs. Molony and Skinner met with Kennecott at the request of Governor Rampton. They agreed at that time to consider the possibility of a three-year contract at less than a dollar an hour. They were asked by the Governor if they would be willing to discuss this with the company and their reply was in the affirmative. The Governor asked the company if they would come forth with a counter offer and the company representative, Mr. Flynn, said he would "respond." The same proposal will be offered when the meeting is held with Governor Babcock next Tuesday with the addition that the wage differ-

ential between Kennecott and Anaconda must be taken into consideration.

They also stated that they were not interested in industry-wide negotiations or agreements but they are interested in company-wide negotiations and agreements.

It is our understanding that the Pima Copper Company of Arizona is interested in a settlement based on an offer by them of 75¢. At least negotiations are going on there and their properties are not shut down.

It appears that the attitude of Kennecott is rather inflexible though the mere fact that they did meet in Salt Lake City might indicate a slight change. The important thing about the Montana operations is the differential between the wages received there and those paid by Kennecott, hence the additional factor in relation to a three-year agreement at less than a dollar or less.

It is our understanding that the Montana wage status is the lowest in the industry except for the operations of the Upper Peninsula in Michigan.

It is our understanding that at this meeting in the Governor's office on October 10th in Helena that the Anaconda people will be represented by a similar group.

MEETING WITH SENATORS MANSFIELD AND METCALF AND SECRETARY McNAMARA OF DEFENSE, SECRETARY WIRTZ OF LABOR AND WALTER A. HAMILTON, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, OCTOBER 9, 1967

We met with Secretaries McNamara of Defense, Wirtz of Labor, and Mr. Walter A. Hamilton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce, representing Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge.

As we are all aware, the Federal Mediation Conciliation Service has been enmeshed in the copper strike since its beginning and is doing the best it can to bring the parties together. I think we can state that the Secretaries have been most interested in this situation since its inception but that they feel that there is nothing that the government can do at this time; that this is a matter which should be settled through the process of free collective bargaining between the union and management; and they are hopeful that this will be done. They were not at all interested about invoking Taft-Hartley or releasing copper from the stockpile. It is indeterminate at this time how much copper is on hand in the normal reserve but there are no indications of a shortage in supply at the moment even though the situation may be becoming somewhat cramped. We feel that the unofficial board of Secretaries with which we met would like to be helpful but they feel as we do, that the government cannot step in unless it is mandatory for the national security which, they indicated, is not the case at this time and they are adverse to recommending Taft-Hartley because it would make a bad situation that much worse and possibly bring about a resumption of the strike into the middle of winter.

The meeting with the three Secretaries was the result of a letter that we sent to the President on Tuesday, October 3. His answer was to set up this meeting and it is our intention to keep in touch with the Secretaries on this matter as well as with the unions and also with some of the Anaconda people in the not too distant future. The three Secretaries will continue to function as a group in this matter.

MEETING WITH CHARLES BRINCKERHOFF, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE ANACONDA CO., OCTOBER 11, 1967

We have just concluded three meetings: First, with Messrs. Joseph Molony and Al Skinner at their request on Friday, October 6; second, with Secretaries McNamara, Wirtz and Walter A. Hamilton, representing Secretary Trowbridge of Commerce, at the President's suggestion, on Monday, October 9;

and, third, with Mr. Charles Brinckerhoff, Chairman of the Board of the Anaconda Company on Wednesday, October 11. Mr. Brinckerhoff was in Washington to attend another meeting.

All parties indicated a real interest in trying to get down to negotiations to the end that the copper strike could be brought to a conclusion.

Speaking for myself, I was pleased that Governor Babcock called a meeting of the unions and the Anaconda officials in Butte on October 10, and I am happy to note that the unions and the Anaconda officials will meet in Butte on Tuesday, October 17. It would be my hope that this meeting would be the kickoff to serious negotiations between Anaconda and the unions and that it would not be just for the purpose of getting together and just indicating that both sides were willing to sit down. If it could be arranged that after this first meeting, further meetings could be held, not in a week or so, but on a day-to-day basis between the two parties with the Mediation and Conciliation Service representative acting as a go-between between the two, it might be possible then to get down to hard bargaining.

It is my belief that three months have been wasted up to this time and that has meant a tremendous decline in income for the people out of work as well as for the State of Montana. It is my further belief that the government does not intend to invoke Taft-Hartley. As the Secretaries indicated to me, there was no national security involved nor does it intend to release any copper from the stockpiles. Therefore, the responsibility rests on the shoulders of the unions and the Company to get together and the only way that could be done, in my opinion, in a continual meeting on a give and take basis on the part of all concerned, and it would be my further hope that if this were done, the present impasse might be broken and perhaps grounds for agreement could be arrived at.

The government will not, in my opinion, intervene in any way at this time. Therefore, with winter coming on, with incomes declining considerably, with needs becoming more apparent, it is necessary that in good faith, all parties concerned get to the table, stay there, and continue negotiations to the end that an agreement can be arrived at.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation, with the consent of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished majority leader for the very forceful manner in which he presented this very vexatious problem.

My State of Nevada likewise is involved with two of the major copper companies. The hardships that are already apparent to the workers who are out of work and have been out of work for some 2 or 3 months are becoming increasingly critical. In the eastern part of my State, where one of the copper companies is located, many of the workers have left to seek employment elsewhere because of the lack of employment.

I commend the majority leader for his forthright statement. It seems to me that until the day comes when both labor and management sit around the conference table day after day and around the clock, as the majority leader suggested, we are not going to break the impasse.

With winter just around the corner in

both the great State of Montana and my State, and particularly in areas where copper companies operate, it is high time that management and labor and their spokesmen worked extra long hours in free collective bargaining to resolve this problem. We cannot permit this impasse to continue.

I congratulate the majority leader for his statement earlier in the session, shortly after the strike began. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], and I joined in a letter to the President, just as the Senator from Montana did at a later date, asking that a factfinding group be appointed to inquire into the issues involved.

I think that the majority leader has performed a great service in this respect in at least a promise that starting tomorrow morning they will get together to discuss this matter. I commend the Senator for his statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his kind remarks.

As the Senator knows, on Friday or Saturday last, an agreement was reached between the steelworkers and the Pima Copper Mining Co., in Arizona. While that company employs only about 650 people, it was, nevertheless, a settlement. The amount arrived at, I think, was 75 cents, which covers hourly increases, fringe benefits, increased pensions, and the like.

I would think there is a meeting ground somewhere between the 50-odd cents which Kennecott in Utah said it was prepared to offer, and the less than \$1 the union said it is prepared to negotiate on. To me there seems to be a degree of flexibility on each side; the parties are not so far apart as to preclude a settlement at an early date. With the proper effort by all of us, this strike can be settled. More than 3 months is too long a time. The strike has already had too harsh an effect on the economy of the people of our States and the States themselves.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding.

(At this point, Mr. INOUYE assumed the chair.)

STATEMENTS OF DEAN RUSK ON VIETNAM ANALYZED

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on Monday, October 12 the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, opened his press conference with a statement which has been marked by editors and commentators as significant. They are not altogether in agreement as to what constitutes the significance, but generally it has been labeled as bold and clarifying. I do not see it as being any more bold than previous statements made by the Secretary nor any clearer since the style and language are those of the Secretary, unless the clarification is in the more simplified and restricted statement of our purpose and objectives in Vietnam. The Secretary did not speak of bringing the good life or the great society to Southeast Asia as a purpose of the war or of honoring the pledges of four Presi-

dents, nor did he suggest that we cannot improve life in our own cities unless we make improvements in Vietnam. He said that we are in Vietnam in our own national interest and to honor our commitment.

Our commitment is clear and our national interest is real—

He said. I do not intend to reopen the question as to whether or not our commitment is clear since this point has been subject to serious debate and challenge for nearly a year and a half.

The Tonkin Gulf resolution in 1964 gave the President no power which he did not already have nor was it in any way an open-ended license for expansion and intensification of the war free from congressional restraint or criticism.

The President, in a recent press conference, indicated the purpose of that resolution. He said the purpose was to keep Congress in place and hold us committed in case there was a change in policy in Southeast Asia.

Our commitment under the SEATO Treaty signed in 1954 was a limited one, imposing a limited obligation upon us, an obligation which was contingent at least in part on the concurrent response of the other major nations in the treaty organizations. There is little to be gained from arguing these quasi-legal points. Any worthwhile debate must deal with the realities of Southeast Asia. The debate on Vietnam is not a matter of variations on a theme although the Secretary evidently wants to have it considered within those limits. It is a debate upon the theme itself and beyond that on the nature of the music which the State Department is playing.

Let me consider first the positive statements made by the Secretary. He said there is "no significant body of American opinion which would have us withdraw from Vietnam" and "no serious opinion among us which wishes to transform this struggle into a general war." I do not know whether this is an accurate statement or not, but in any case it is irrelevant since the debate on our policy in Vietnam falls between these two extremes.

Early in his remarks the Secretary speaks of the fate which Asian communism has planned for Southeast Asia. Asian communism, for that matter world communism, undoubtedly has a fate planned for Southeast Asia and for all the world, but the fact that it has such plans does not necessarily mean that they are possible of realization or that we have to respond to every action as though the total plan were in operation and likely to be realized.

On the record, the Secretary has not shown himself to be the most accurate judge of Chinese intentions or potential or of the other forces running within the world. I quote from his May 18, 1951, speech before the China Institute in New York: he describes "greedy hands" of Russia stretching out to dismember China.

He said:

China is being sacrificed to the ambitions of the communist conspiracy. China has been driven by foreign masters into an adventure of foreign aggression . . . (Korea);

the Peiping regime may be a colonial Russian government—a Slavic Manchukuo on a larger scale. It is not the government of China. It does not pass the first test. It is not Chinese.

He said of the Nationalist Chinese government:

We believe it more authentically represents the views of the great body of the people of China, particularly their historical demand for independence from foreign control.

The debate on Vietnam is not, as the Secretary states, essentially over procedures for carrying out policies on which the Nation is united. This is a debate on matters of great substance over which the Nation is indeed deeply divided and concerned. The Secretary may speak as solemnly as he can—and he can speak solemnly—but the Members of Congress and the people of the country must continue to ask and seek answers to the question, "What is America's proper role in the world and what is the bearing of the policy in Vietnam on the fulfillment of that role?" We cannot permit the Secretary to dismiss, even solemnly, the United Nations and the recommendations of Members of the Senate including the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, with the easy remark:

There are some problems about going through an exercise of futility . . . to satisfy some critics among our own people.

Members of the Senate have a clear constitutional responsibility, which becomes personal because of their position, to be concerned over foreign policy, a responsibility which in the case of the Secretary of State exists only by delegation or proxy. As a matter of fact much of what has been done or what is being done in Vietnam may be a costly exercise in futility—that the bombing of North Vietnam for example, if we are to accept the recent testimony of the Secretary of Defense regarding the failure of that bombing to reduce significantly the supply of arms and men to the South, may be such an exercise; that the much publicized program of pacification, more recently labeled "revolutionary development," which is essentially an attempt to graft onto Asian society Western values and institutions and practices, may also be an exercise in futility.

The one rather clear conclusion from his remarks is that in his mind, the United States must establish and maintain an anti-Communist bastion in South Vietnam and that this is essential as a part of the overall strategy of containing China through encirclement and that all of this bears quite directly on our national interest, if not our survival. This is a continuing application of the strategic theory of John Foster Dulles and reflects in action the ancient fear of the yellow peril presented to us now in a new image of the Secretary of State in his words:

Within the next decade or two there will be a billion Chinese on the Mainland, armed with nuclear weapons, with no certainty about what their attitude toward the rest of Asia will be.

If this is the specter that is haunting Asia, it is difficult to see how we will rid

Asia of it even though we achieve an unpredictable and total victory in South Vietnam.

I fail to see the relationship between the 1 billion and nuclear weapons. We have in this country 200 million people, very nearly, but only one of them has control over nuclear weapons.

The Secretary seems to accept the Chinese Communists belief that their doctrine of world revolution is applicable to the entire underdeveloped world. It must be encouraging to the Chinese propagandists to see this basic tenet of their political philosophy accepted and endorsed by the American Secretary of State.

I think, Mr. President, that we must ask ourselves: What is the real measure of the Chinese threat? What does it show on the record? There may be every reason to believe that the leaders in Peking are firmly convinced that their revolution will serve as a model for the developing world and for the eventual defeat of the industrial "cities" by the countryside of the "people," in reality, the Chinese experience has, with one significant exception, almost no relevance outside China. In no other country or part of the world do precisely the same conditions exist under which the Chinese Communists achieved power. Mao was able to gain control of China because he gained leadership of the Chinese nationalist movement, consolidating, and leading it against a foreign invader in World War II. Only in Vietnam has this feat been duplicated. Ho Chi Minh is the only Communist leader in the underdeveloped world who was able to gain control of his country's nationalist movement at the time of resistance to a foreign invasion.

Throughout the underdeveloped world, Chinese attempts to promote their style of revolution have met with failure, largely because of internal forces, of which nationalism itself is the most important.

The failure of the Communist attempt to gain control of Indonesia in late 1965 was a disaster of major proportions. China's attack on India in 1962 and her support of Pakistan on the Kashmir issue have dealt a severe blow to whatever hopes Indian Communists might have had for capitalizing on India's internal problems and divisions.

In Japan the Communist Party has followed the Peking line at great cost, alienating the trade unions and the powerful Japanese Socialist Party. Even North Korea has proclaimed its "neutrality" in the Sino-Soviet Communist struggle. China's lack of success in Africa has also been noteworthy. The Government of Malawi had to get rid of some cabinet ministers for allegedly conspiring with the Chinese; Kenya expelled the New China News Agency correspondent "in the interests of national security"; Burundi, once regarded as safely in the Chinese camp, expelled Peking's diplomatic mission. In Latin America, the Chinese have had even less success. Even Fidel Castro, whose rise to power had been hailed in Peking as a demonstration of the validity of the Chinese analysis of the Latin American rev-

olutionary situation, has also denounced China.

China continues to talk a world power game, but even with nuclear weapons, the evidence of internal economic difficulties, particularly the food-population problem, and the political struggle, which may be only a dress rehearsal for what will come after Mao passes from the scene, suggest that China's principal concern and effort will remain domestic and internal for a long time to come.

China's foreign policy objectives are of concern to us, but there is significant disagreement—which we must also acknowledge—about her ability to pursue these objectives successfully. She seeks recognition as a great power whose voice is heard in the world's councils. China, understandably, seeks to overcome the bitter legacy of a hundred years of humiliation by the West. Recognition as a great power is essentially a nationalist, rather than a ideological objective. All Chinese, Communist and non-Communist, agree on its importance.

China also seeks recovery of the "lost territories," Hong Kong, Macao, parts of Soviet Asia, Taiwan and the offshore islands, and land along the Sino-Indian frontier. This is also an essentially nationalist objective, shared by all Chinese. In Chinese eyes, it is not an expansionist position, for they consider that these territories were taken forcibly from China by the unequal treaties imposed on her during the 19th century, or in the case of Taiwan, were denied to her by the military power of the U.S. 7th Fleet.

China seeks to reestablish what she considers her traditional sphere of influence in Southeast Asia and to eradicate U.S. military power from the Asian mainland. Chinese political domination in that area has not been clear or consistent, at least not since the 10th century when Vietnam achieved "independence" from China. At times the relationship appears to have meant little more than tacit agreement not to aid China's enemies.

China's desire to eliminate U.S. power and influence from the Asian mainland, where it conforms to Communist ideological opposition to democratic philosophy, is basically nationalistic and there is little reason to believe that a non-Communist Chinese government would welcome a U.S. presence on the Asian mainland any more than the present government in Peking actually does.

Our policy in the Far East is based largely on unsubstantiated assumptions. First, we assume that revolutions throughout the less-developed world are a Chinese-inspired wave of the future and that Vietnam is a test case for guerrilla war and for wars of national liberation. There is no good reason for accepting this characterization of the war in Vietnam. The techniques of the Chinese revolution have not yet proved fully successful in China; they are a long way from inspiring revolution in other parts of the world. Second, we assert that the Southeast Asia situation is analogous to previous situations and experiences in Asia and in Europe. Military contain-

ment worked in Europe and in Korea, according to the theory; thus it is the method to be applied in Southeast Asia or in any other test area. But the conditions under which containment was effective in Europe and in Korea do not exist in Southeast Asia, which is marked by deep ethnic and social divisions; by instability, political and social; by deep antagonism to Western colonialism; and by a desire for change rather than for a return to the past.

Many of our problems today are the result of our unwillingness or inability in the past to anticipate what might be the shape of the world 20 years in the future. Few Americans expected in 1945 that 20 years later we would still have 225,000 troops in Europe. We have 55,000 troops in South Korea 14 years after the end of the fighting yet at the height of the Korean conflict, we never had as many troops committed as we have today in Vietnam. We must ask whether we are prepared to maintain from 100,000 to 200,000 troops in South Vietnam as well, for 15 or 20 years after the fighting stops. If we are not prepared to do so, the process must be reversed before temporary commitment assumes the character of a permanent establishment and an irritation in the changed context of another generation. We must begin now the adjustments of attitude which will be necessary if we are to reduce or liquidate our commitments in Asia.

The long-range question is whether the United States and China are on a collision course. The likelihood of confrontation, of ultimate showdown, is not immediate, and certainly is not inevitable.

With regret I must conclude that the Secretary, in his remarks, has added nothing constructive to the debate of American involvement in Southeast Asia by way of new facts, new policies, strategy, or understanding, but rather because of the posture, almost of defiance, careless of intentional abuse of the language, can serve only to raise the emotional level of the debate, obscure the issues upon which judgment should be made and cause further frustration and division within the country, I believe, as well as between the Congress and the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota on the excellent statement which he made involving present discussions concerning Vietnam, and I share with him concern about peace for the future. He is one of the most perceptive of U.S. Senators, and certainly one of the most eloquent, and we are always glad to see him display this kind of interest on this subject.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

THEODORE C. SORESENSEN TO BREAK 4 YEARS OF SILENCE ON VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I think it is an important matter also, with respect to Vietnam, that there will come on the newsstands tomorrow morning an article which breaks a 4-year record of silence by a man who served in the White House under two Presidents. This is the first statement to date on this subject by one of America's most recognized authorities. Certainly, after 4 years of silence, it would be important for us to read the article in the Saturday Review which will appear on the newsstands tomorrow, under date of October 21, by Theodore Sorensen.

The substance of Mr. Sorensen's approach is that he sees Vietnam leading the United States to its own self-destruction. I think he makes an earnest plea, without criticism, of approaches for America and its leadership to find a way out. He makes the statement without regard necessarily to who should be the leading party to call the meeting which would necessarily result in talks, but he does point out that talks of this kind are not necessarily doomed to end in disagreement and disappointment.

He points out four basic approaches which, if both sides used them, could work. I thoroughly endorse this approach as not necessarily the only one, but a workable one.

The first is to return to the Geneva Agreement of 1954.

The second is for an end to hostilities and a withdrawal of all foreign troops and bases.

The third is for a neutral, peaceful, independent South Vietnam, free to determine by election its own new political and social system and its relationship with and its reunification with the north.

And fourth, for a government, if necessary—though neither Saigon nor the NLF has squarely faced this—a coalition government, composed of all parties, as in the Laotian settlement of 1962, acting on behalf of all Vietnamese citizens in accordance with the principles of universal suffrage, free speech, free worship, and meaningful land redistribution.

I think all people will look on this statement as one which not only deserves our attention, but, considering the record of 4 years of silence by this authority, deserves the attention and concern of all of us.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950,

so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the Internal Security Act of 1950, which S. 2171 seeks to amend, was enacted over the veto of President Harry S. Truman. I believe it would be most worthwhile for the Senate to review the legislative and judicial history of that act. In his veto message of September 22, 1950, President Truman displayed characteristic courage, and remarkable foresight when he wrote:

The idea of requiring Communist organizations to divulge information about themselves is a simple and attractive one. But it is about as practical as requiring thieves to register with the sheriff. Obviously, no such organization as the Communist Party is likely to register voluntarily.

President Truman, after reviewing the evidentiary problems which would confront the Attorney General in a registration proceeding, continued:

If, eventually, the Attorney General should overcome these difficulties and get a favorable decision from the Board, the Board's decision could be appealed to the courts. The courts would review any questions of law involved, and whether the Board's findings of facts were supported by the preponderance of the evidence.

Then with amazing prophetic perception, President Truman wrote:

All these proceedings would require great effort and much time. It is almost certain that from 2 to 4 years would elapse between the Attorney General's decision to go before the Board with a case, and the final disposition of the matter by the courts.

And when all this time and effort had been spent, it is still most likely that no organization would actually register.

Mr. President, let me reread for emphasis that last statement of President Truman's when he vetoed the Internal Security Act of 1950:

And when all this time and effort had been spent, it is still most likely that no organization would actually register.

Let us look at the record. Since 1950, the Justice Department has brought actions under the Internal Security Act against the Communist Party itself, 22 alleged front organizations, and 44 individuals. How many have registered? Harry Truman was absolutely right. Not a single individual or organization has registered.

President Truman was deeply concerned not only about the futility and expense of the Internal Security Act, but also about the profound threat to traditional American liberties posed by this act.

He stated it this way:

Unfortunately, these provisions are not merely ineffective and unworkable. They represent a clear and present danger to our institutions. . . the application of the registration requirements to so-called Communist-front organizations can be the greatest danger to freedom of speech, since the Alien and Sedition Laws of 1798. This danger arises out of the criteria or standards to be applied in determining whether an organization is a Communist-front organization.

These would be no serious problem if the bill required proof that an organization was controlled and financed by the Communist Party before it could be classified as a Communist-front organization. However, recognizing the difficulty of proving these matters,

the bill would permit such a determination to be based solely upon the extent to which the positions taken or advanced by it from time to time on matters of policy do not deviate from those of the Communist movement.

With keenness, President Truman realized that—

This provision could easily be used to classify as a Communist-front organization any organization which is advocating a single policy or objective which is also being urged by the Communist Party or by a Communist foreign government.

President Truman summarized his objections to these sections of the bill when he wrote:

The basic error of these sections is that they move in the direction of suppressing opinion and belief. This would be a very dangerous course to take, not because we have any sympathy for Communist opinions, but because any governmental stifling of the free expression of opinion is a long step toward totalitarianism.

Harry Truman spoke for America, our values, and our principles when he added:

There is no more fundamental axiom of American freedom than the familiar statement: "In a free country, we punish men for the acts they commit, but never for the opinions they have." And the reason this is so fundamental to freedom is not, as many suppose, that it protects the few unorthodox from suppression by the majority. To permit freedom of expression is primarily for the benefit of the majority because it protects criticism, and criticism leads to progress.

In continuing his veto message, President Truman simply and straight-forwardly captured the central truth about freedom of speech in our society:

We can and we will prevent espionage, sabotage, or other actions endangering our national security. But we would betray our finest traditions if we attempted, as this bill would attempt, to curb the simple expression of opinion. This we should never do, no matter how distasteful the opinion may be to the vast majority of our people. The course proposed by this bill would delight the Communists, for it would make a mockery of the Bill of Rights and of our claim to stand for freedom in the world.

And what kind of effect would these provisions have on the normal expression of political views? Obviously, if this law were on the statute books, the part of prudence would be to avoid saying anything that might be construed by someone as not deviating sufficiently from the current Communist propaganda line. And since no one could be sure in advance what views were safe to express, the inevitable tendency would be to express no views on controversial subjects.

The result—

As clearly seen by President Truman—could only be to reduce the vigor and strength of our political life—an outcome that the Communists would happily welcome, but that free men should abhor.

President Truman reminded us eloquently:

We need not fear the expression of ideas—we do need to fear their suppression.

Mr. President, anyone who lived through the dark days which followed or can read about them knows how very right Harry Truman was proved. We know all too well the orthodoxy which was so widely revered. We know of the

blacklist and the willingness, even the zeal, of some to equate dissent with disloyalty and to punish error as though it were treason.

This was a national malady, not the exclusive practice of one party or one group. But our national dialog was diminished and our national life was impoverished as a result. We spent inordinate time and tremendous energy—proving our total anticommunism and corresponding pro-Americanism.

I believe the Nation has matured since that experience. I believe that we profited from that tragic lesson.

But I wonder, Mr. President, when I hear the level to which our debate in this very Chamber has slipped in the past week.

On last Wednesday on this floor the sponsor of S. 2171, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in support of his motion to suspend the rules, quoted the testimony of Herbert A. Philbrick, the former informant for the FBI, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee this year.

The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] quoted Mr. Philbrick as follows:

There is no question but that the law the Communists fear the most, the law that they fought the longest and the hardest was the Internal Security Act of 1950. The Communists fought that measure tooth and nail, in court and out, week in and week out, for 15 solid years.

Mr. President, I know that the Communists opposed the Internal Security Act when it was before the Congress. But I do not take lightly any implication that the Communists and their sympathizers or unwitting accomplices were the only people who opposed this act.

A great President and a great American, Harry S. Truman, opposed the Internal Security Act.

The Department of Justice, ably headed by then Attorney General and later Supreme Court Justice, Tom Clark, opposed the Internal Security Act.

The Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Central Intelligence Agency opposed the Internal Security Act.

The New York Times, the Washington Post, the Boston Herald, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch opposed the Internal Security Act.

Senator Paul H. Douglas, a truly great American, opposed the Internal Security Act.

Clarence Mitchell, an outstanding American, testified against the Internal Security Act in behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

William Green of the American Federation of Labor, James Patton of the National Farmers Union, Charles M. LaFollette of the Americans for Democratic Action, Dr. Ralph E. Himstead of the American Association of University Professors, Benjamin Epstein of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, John W. Edelman of the Textile Workers Union, and Bishop John Wesley Lord of the Methodist Church also opposed the Internal Security Act.

I want to make it crystal clear, Mr. President, that respected, responsible, and renowned Americans whose devotion to country is far, far beyond question opposed this act before it was enacted and continued their opposition.

I do not pretend to know the motives of the Communist Party officials and members who opposed this act for 15 years. But I reject absolutely any suggestion no matter how subtle that Communists alone, have constituted or been the moving force behind the opposition to this act.

President Truman concluded his veto message of the Internal Security Act in this way:

I do not undertake lightly the responsibility of differing with the majority in both Houses of Congress who have voted for this bill. We are all Americans; we all wish to safeguard and preserve our Constitutional liberties against internal and external enemies. But I cannot approve this legislation, which instead of accomplishing its avowed purpose would actually interfere with our liberties and help the Communists against whom the bill was aimed.

Speaking at the time of the Korean war, President Truman said:

This is a time when we must marshal all our resources and all the moral strength of our free system in self-defense against the threat of Communist aggression. We will fail in this, and we will destroy all that we seek to preserve, if we sacrifice the liberties of our citizens in a misguided attempt to achieve national security.

There is no reason why we should fail. Our country has been through dangerous times before without losing our liberties to external attack or internal hysteria. Each of us, in Government and out, has a share in guarding our liberties. Each of us must search his own conscience to find whether he is doing all that can be done to preserve and strengthen them.

No consideration of expediency can justify the enactment of such a bill as this, a bill which would so greatly weaken our liberties and give aid and comfort to those who would destroy us. I have, therefore no alternative but to return this bill without my approval, and I earnestly request the Congress to reconsider its action.

Mr. President, what a truly remarkable message from a truly remarkable man. What candor, what courage, what confidence in our free system and free institutions.

These words of President Truman are timeless. They were written at a time of national hysteria when paranoia was on the ascent in our midst. They are just as timely, just as relevant today—17 years later—when the Communist Party in the United States by its own admission and the information of the FBI is one-tenth the size it was then.

Why do we need this emergency act of legislative resuscitation to put new life into the moribund Subversive Activities Control Board? Do we need to protect our young people? By the party's own admission and the best estimates of reliable sources, there are only 500 members of the Communist Party of the United States between the ages of 17 and 30.

Just think of that: 500 between the ages of 17 and 30, when almost half our population, or close to 100 million Americans, is under the age of 30.

Others may put their faith and trust in some vigilante board to make determinations of Communist action, Communist front, and Communist back. But the senior Senator from Wisconsin prefers to put his faith in the native common-sense of the American people and their individual and collective experience with free institutions and a democratic system that finds its own remedies for social ills and injustices.

These, to my mind, are far more powerful safeguards against the Communist Party and its menace than hastily drawn, hastily considered legislation.

Let us not obfuscate the issue with jingoism, either. Let us not confuse the military aggression of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese against American troops with the hapless meanderings of a Gus Hall.

I thought we had learned that communism does not exist or prosper in a vacuum. Communism feeds upon the tragic conditions of poverty, injustice, ignorance, and disease. This is why aggressive communism is a real and terrible threat to Vietnam, and this is why the Communist Party in this country today appeals to only one out of every 20,000 Americans.

If communism were to vanish from the face of the earth tomorrow, our awesome national problems would remain. The absence of communism would not miraculously solve the problems of our cities, eliminate the poverty in our Nation, purify the air we breathe or the water we drink.

The disappearance of communism would not magically resolve our racial tensions or solve the problems of organized crime.

As President Truman said so very well about the original Internal Security Act: The idea is a simple and attractive one.

We must have learned by now that the most effective bulwarks against Communist subversion are not vigilantes, but rather full political, economic, and social justice. Where these are secure, communism has no foothold save for the tiny minority of misfits and misanthropes.

In order to fully understand the Internal Security Act of 1950, one must consider it in relation to the Smith Act.

The Smith Act was originally enacted on June 28, 1940, as sections 2, 3, and 5 of the Alien Registration Act, 1940. In 1948, the provisions of the Act were revised and recodified as section 2385 of the Criminal Code.

The chief provision of the Smith Act which deals with subversive activities made it unlawful for any person: First to knowingly or willfully advocate, abet, advise, or teach the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing State or Federal Government in the United States by force or violence; second, to help to organize any society or group of persons who teach, advocate, or encourage such forcible overthrow; third, to affiliate with such society or group, knowing the purposes thereof—the "membership clause"—or; fourth, to conspire to commit any of the foregoing acts.

So this act not only covers those who

knowingly or willfully advocate the violent overthrow, but also makes it unlawful for any person to associate with such a group.

The Internal Security Act, from the date of its enactment was on a collision course with the Smith Act, because while the Smith Act provided for the prosecution of Communist organizations and of those who are knowing members of such organizations, the Internal Security Act required such organizations and their members to come forward and register themselves as Communist organizations or as knowing members of such organizations.

So with the operation of the two laws we are faced with the situation that if the Communist Party, obeying the Internal Security Act, registers and files its membership list, every person on the list is immediately exposed to serious and substantial threat of prosecution under the Smith Act.

On March 3, 1967, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia unanimously held that the fifth amendment prohibited this dual operation.

It has been suggested, and I believe logically so, that the Government must make a choice between the two acts, opting either to retain the Smith Act with its prosecutions or the Internal Security Act with its registrations.

But I believe it is irrefutable that any choice, any change in existing law in view of the *Albertson* case and the Communist Party case must be attended by thorough investigation, full consultation of all expert persons and organizations as well as with the full participation of the executive branch.

We certainly have not had that, Mr. President, on this bill. The minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has told us that the President wants this bill enacted. I do not doubt the word of the minority leader. He is a most honorable man. But I am at a loss to understand why the President chooses this most extraordinary means of communicating his support of a particular piece of legislation.

If the President wants this bill in its present form, without hearings, without the opinion of the Department of Justice, why has he not made his wishes known to other Senators? Why has he selected only his good friend and our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], to be the sole repository of his feelings?

I, for one, would appreciate hearing from the administration and the Department of Justice on S. 2171, and I am sure many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle would likewise be appreciative.

Apparently, the President of the United States has not communicated with the majority leader on this bill. He has not communicated with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary—the committee that has jurisdiction over it—to the best of our knowledge, who also happens to be chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

In my opinion, the President of the United States has been criticized very unfairly by many people, because I be-

lieve he is a man of great and demonstrated character. But nobody has accused President Johnson of being bashful or of being reluctant to pick up the telephone and communicate with Members of Congress on any measure on which he has feelings. In this case, the President of the United States has not let us know how he feels about this legislation. As President Truman indicated, it goes right to the heart of our liberties.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the registration requirement of the Internal Security Act was finally interred by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on March 3, 1967, when that court invalidated an attempt to register the Communist Party through two informants.

The Justice Department did not exercise its option of appealing the court of appeals decision to the Supreme Court. In short, the Justice Department was content to let the matter drop.

But almost 5 months after the court of appeals decision and only 6 days after wide criticism in the press of a Presidential appointment to the Subversive Activities Control Board, the distinguished minority leader introduced S. 2171 which was the subject of no hearings before the Judiciary Committee and was reported favorably on August 15.

I have said that the unanimous court of appeals decision, this past March, permanently interred the registration section of the Internal Security Act. Actually the registration section was dealt a fatal blow almost 2 years ago in the case of *Albertson v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, 382 U.S. 70 (1965).

By virtue of section 8 of the Internal Security Act, when an organization fails to register in compliance with an order of the Board, individual members in the organization must register. Acting under section 13 of the act, the Attorney General instituted a proceeding before the Board for the purpose of obtaining an order directing *Albertson* and others to register. The Supreme Court set aside the order of the Board, holding the order violated the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

In a unanimous 8-to-0 decision, the Supreme Court declared in the *Albertson* case:

The risks of incrimination which the petitioners take in registering are obvious. Form IS-52a requires an admission of membership in the Communist Party. Such an admission of membership may be used to prosecute the registrant under the membership clause of the Smith Act or under Section 4(a) of the Subversive Activities Control Act, to mention only two federal criminal statutes. . . . It follows that the requirement to accomplish registration by completing and filing Form IS-52a is inconsistent with the protection of the Self-Incrimination Clause.

Justice Potter Stewart spoke for the Court.

Justice Black stated that he concurred in the ruling for all the reasons set out in the Court's opinion as well as for those stated in his dissenting opinion in *Communist Party of the United States v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, 367 U.S. 1 at 137 (1961) where with respect to the Subversive Activities Control Act as a whole, he had said:

In my judgment, the Act here under consideration is unconstitutional on at least three grounds in addition to its direct conflict with the self-incrimination provisions of the Fifth Amendment. It is, in the first instance, a classical bill of attainder which our Constitution in two places prohibits, for it is a legislative Act that inflicts pains, penalties, and punishments in a number of ways without a judicial trial . . . The Act . . . not only is a legislative bill of attainder but also violates due process by short-cutting practically all of the Bill of Rights, leaving no hope for anyone entangled in this legislative-administrative web except what has proved in this case to be one of the most truncated judicial reviews that the history of the Court can afford.

I think also that the outlawing of the Communist Party and imprisonment of its members violate the First Amendment.

But perhaps the Justice whose opinion in the *Albertson* case was most interesting was that of the man who as Attorney General in 1948 had expressed doubt as to the constitutionality of such registration provisions, Justice Clark, wrote, in part:

I join in the opinion of the Court. The conclusion it reaches today was forecast in 1948. In response to the request of the Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee for an expression of the views of the Department of Justice on H.R. 5852, a precursor of the Act under attack, it was then pointed out that the "measure might be held . . . even to compel self-incrimination."

I want to emphasize that the decisions in both these cases mentioned, the *Albertson* case and the *Communist Party* case, before the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, respectively, were unanimous—all Justices, the so-called conservative wing or bloc and the liberal wing or bloc, all voted unanimously to find this provision unconstitutional.

The *Albertson* decision, delivered during the October term of the Supreme Court in 1965 for all practical purposes put the Subversive Activities Control Board out of business.

But it was not until public attention focused on the Board's total 2-year dormancy at great public expense and the caliber of Board members that the overwhelming need for this legislation asserted itself.

Perhaps I am not so watchful—although I try hard—as the senior Senator from Illinois. But I have not seen any alarming improvement in Communist fortunes in the United States in the past 2 years. I have not perceived, nor have I been informed of any recent, rising Red tide in the United States which would shock the Senate into emergency action to resuscitate the Subversive Activities Control Board.

If there is such an alarming movement, I should like to hear about it from

the Department of Justice, from the Attorney General. I would want to know if the Department and the distinguished and able Attorney General could trace this purported waxing of Communist strength to either the *Albertson* decision or the court of appeals decision of last March. Certainly, if there is both a causal and time relationship between the resurgence of the Communist Party in the United States and the eclipse of the Subversive Activities Control Board, every Senator, and every American should be apprised of it.

The best place to make these determinations is before an appropriate congressional committee in open hearings. Unfortunately, as we all know, S. 2171 was not the subject of any hearings—either closed or open.

Mr. President, these are important questions we are discussing. These questions affect the basic civil liberties of American citizens. This legislation involves fundamental constitutional questions of freedom of speech and protection from self-incrimination. The Senate and the American people are entitled to hear from our Nation's highest legal officer and that Department which would be charged under the act with its enforcement. Until we have these opinions, and those of other experts in this area, we cannot legislate intelligently or responsibly.

Mr. President, this bill S. 2171, would resuscitate a board that has been virtually inactive for the past 20 months. I cannot repeat this too often, because it is central to our position, that this effort at artificial respiration was reported from the Senate Judiciary Committee without hearings, with a completely inadequate report—a one-page report—which said nothing at all about the bill except that it was reported favorably and without any recommendations pro or con from the administration.

In fact, the bill itself had to be substantially modified after it was reported from the Senate Judiciary Committee. In the words of the bill's sponsor, Senator DIRKSEN, this was due to printing errors. However, whole lines in the bill have been deleted and reworked in the modified version. For example:

SEC. 6. Beginning with (j), all that of subsection (a) of section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act down to and including the end thereof is amended so as to read: "is replaced by the following language," a "printing correction";

SEC. 6. Beginning with the clause designation "(1)" contained in section 11(a) of the Subversive Activities Control Act, strike out all of that subsection down to and including the words "register under section 7", and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That is some printer's error. It is obviously a very substantial change from what is in the bill.

Furthermore, certain obvious technical errors in the bill remain even after the modifications. For example, although sections 7 and 8 of the Subversive Activities Control Act are repealed by the bill, the following sections, beginning with section 9 are not renumbered. This means that the Subversive Activities Control Act, as it would be amended by the Dirksen bill, would contain no sections 7 and 8. The act would jump di-

rectly from section 6 to section 9. I do not know whether there is any precedent for this type of amendment, but certainly it should be corrected if at all possible.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to discuss the actual language of the Dirksen bill as it amends the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 since the report on the legislation tells us very little about the bill's contents. It is true that the senior Senator from Illinois did insert a section-by-section explanation of the bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Wednesday, October 11. However, I believe that this explanation leaves a good deal to be desired. Furthermore, we have never had the benefit of a so-called Cordon print which reprints the act amended showing what language has been deleted from the Subversive Activities Control Act and what language has been added by the Dirksen proposal.

Such a document has been prepared for me by the Library of Congress, however, and I should now like to go over in some detail the 1950 act and the changes made by the Dirksen bill.

Section 1(a) of the 1950 act is retained. It tells us that title I of the Internal Security Act "may be cited as the 'Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950'." Strangely enough, the committee report on the Dirksen bill, which should have gone under some such title as the Subversive Activities Control Amendments of 1967 was titled Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. That is the way the bill came to us this year, as the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. Well, we know from section 1(a) of the 1950 act that this title was appropriate 17 years ago. It is hardly suitable for a bill reported from committee in 1967.

Section 1(b) of the 1950 act, also retained, states:

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize, require, or establish military or civilian censorship or in any way to limit or infringe upon freedom of the press or of speech as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States and no regulation shall be promulgated hereunder having that effect.

In other words, we have here a disclaimer on the part of Congress that this legislation was meant to infringe on the constitutional rights of free speech or the press. We have no mention of the constitutional protection against self-incrimination. This, in fact, was the single right that the courts have held—as I have just stated—the legislation did violate. Furthermore, there has been a great deal of discussion over the years of whether or not this disclaimer is consonant with the act as a whole. Many feel that the legislation as passed by Congress does infringe upon freedom of speech, in that it restricts freedom of association. However, I do not necessarily endorse this viewpoint. In any event I shall not go into this issue at this time.

Section 2 of the 1950 act is retained in its entirety. It recites the necessity for the passage of the 1950 act in the following language:

SEC. 2. As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Congress hereby finds that—

(1) There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development,

and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in the countries throughout the world through the medium of a world-wide Communist organization.

(2) The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism, and brutality.

(3) The system of government known as a totalitarian dictatorship is characterized by the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial basis, and by substantial identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists.

(4) The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing the floor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House, had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2121) to extend the provisions of the Act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROONEY of New York, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SLACK, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. MAHON, Mr. BOW, Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. CEDERBERG, and Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when the quorum call was suggested, I was indicating what section 2 of the 1950 act provides, because that section as written is still in the bill in its entirety, and is not changed by the proposed legislation. It will stay in the law whether the Dirksen bill is enacted or not.

It indicates, as I say, the necessity in the view of the House and Senate for the passage of the 1950 act.

Section 6 provides:

(6) The Communist action organizations so established and utilized in various countries, acting under such control, direction, and discipline, endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments by any available means, including force if necessary, and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship.

At this point I interrupt to say that this is one part of the 1950 act which may well have been the case at that time, but which might very well be revised, and I think it should be revised, to take account of the realities in the world today in which there is not merely one dominant totalitarian dictatorship in Moscow, but there is also a very militant competitive dictatorship in Peking which in the view of many experts, including the Secretary of State and the Vice President of the United States, represents a most profound threat to this country.

Continuing with section 6:

Although such organizations usually designate themselves as political parties, they are in fact constituent elements of the world-wide Communist movement and promote the objectives of such movement by conspiratorial and coercive tactics, instead of through the democratic processes of a free elective system or through the freedom-preserving means employed by a political party which operates as an agency by which people govern themselves.

Section 7 provides:

In carrying on the activities referred to in paragraph (6), such Communist organizations in various countries are organized on a secret, conspiratorial basis and operate to a substantial extent through organizations, commonly known as "Communist fronts", which in most instances are created and maintained, or used, in such manner as to conceal the facts as to their true character and purposes and their membership. One result of this method of operation is that such affiliated organizations are able to obtain financial and other support from persons who would not extend such support if they knew the true purposes of, and the actual

nature of the control and influence exerted upon, such "Communist fronts".

Section 8 provides:

Due to the nature and scope of the world Communist movement, with the existence of affiliated constituent elements working toward common objectives in various countries of the world, travel of Communist members, representatives, and agents from country to country facilitates communication and is a prerequisite for the carrying on of activities to further the purposes of the Communist movement.

Section 9 finds:

In the United States those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in the world Communist movement, when they so participate, in effect repudiate their allegiance to the United States, and in effect transfer their allegiance to the foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement.

Once again, Mr. President, this brings to mind the fact that since 1950 the world Communist movement has undergone a dramatic and very important change. As I have said, in the eyes of many people the principal threat to peace is from Peking; and the language in the act as it is now and as it would not be amended by the Dirksen bill assumes that Moscow dominates and directs the activities in Peking. It is obvious to anybody who can read a newspaper that Peking is highly competitive and militantly opposed in many cases and on many occasions to Moscow.

No. 10:

In pursuance of communism's stated objectives, the most powerful existing Communist dictatorship has, by the methods referred to above, already caused the establishment in numerous foreign countries of Communist totalitarian dictatorships, and threatens to establish similar dictatorships in still other countries.

Once again, we have a situation which was perhaps correct in 1950 and we know is not correct now. Many people argue, and argue with good commonsense, that the principal domination in this hemisphere, for example, is from Peking and from Chinese communism and not from Moscow communism, although both, of course, would like to subvert the free world. But in not taking account of Chinese communism—a much more militant and aggressive kind of communism and one which we know in Southeast Asia has caused us such grief—this act is certainly defective, and the directions under the act which would affect people in this country are inadequate:

(11) The agents of communism have devised clever and ruthless espionage and sabotage tactics which are carried out in many instances in form or manner successfully evasive of existing law.

(12) The Communist network in the United States is inspired and controlled in large part by foreign agents who are sent into the United States ostensibly as attachés of foreign legations, affiliates of international organizations, members of trading commissions, and in similar capacities, but who use their diplomatic or semidiplomatic status as a shield behind which to engage in activities prejudicial to the public security.

(13) There are, under our present immigration laws, numerous aliens who have been found to be deportable many of whom are in the subversive, criminal, or immoral

classes who are free to roam the country at will without supervision or control.

(14) One device for infiltration by Communists is by procuring naturalization for disloyal aliens who use their citizenship as a badge for admission into the fabric of our society.

(15) The Communist movement in the United States is an organization numbering thousands of adherents, rigidly and ruthlessly disciplined. Awaiting and seeking to advance a moment when the United States may be so far extended by foreign engagements, so far divided in counsel, or so far in industrial or financial straits, that overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence may seem possible of achievement, it seeks converts far and wide by an extensive system of schooling and indoctrination. Such preparations by Communist organizations in other countries have aided in supplanting existing governments. The Communist organization in the United States, pursuing its stated objectives, the recent successes of Communist methods in other countries, and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself, present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions, and make it necessary that Congress, in order to provide for the common defense, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation, and to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such worldwide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

Undoubtedly, most of us would subscribe to much of the material in this recitation of the dangers of the world Communist movement. However, I believe there is an increasing skepticism about the statement contained in section (4) that the direction of the world Communist movement is exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country. This language may have been adequate back in 1950, a couple of years before Stalin's death and only 4 years after mainland China had become a so-called People's Republic. As a matter of fact, I would say it was less than 2 years from the time that Red China had clear de facto control of mainland China.

However, the Soviet Union today is faced with strong competition for the control of indigenous Communist movements in the underdeveloped nations in the southern hemisphere continents of Africa and South America. Even eastern European countries, such as Rumania and Albania, have shown marked reluctance to follow certain policy lines laid down in Moscow. In fact, I believe it is fair to say that the statements made in section 2 of the act more adequately describe a single branch of the Communist movement—the Red Chinese branch—even though when these words were written and this bill was drafted in 1950, obviously, the drafters of the legislation had in mind the Russian communism.

I believe that Mao Tse-tung might well agree with this evaluation. His violent denunciations of the Russian revisionists that followed Stalin's death are ample indications of his feelings about the matter.

Roger Hilsman, former Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, said in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far

East and the Pacific in 1966 that the Sino-Soviet split is "one of the most portentous international political developments of our time."

The real threat to world peace is now, as Vice President HUMPHREY observed in a speech yesterday in Doylestown, Pa., is "militant, aggressive Asian communism, with its headquarters in Peking, China."

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise to support the pending measure, S. 2171, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Illinois.

It is with great interest that I have listened to the discussion on this bill.

One of the items that has been especially interesting to me is the proposition that the discussion by the then-President Truman when the bill was enacted 17 years ago that the Communists would be helped by this bill. It was said that the cause of the majority of people in America and their constitutional rights and freedoms would be harmed. A number of other deficiencies of the bill of 1950 were alleged, but eventually the bill was written into law.

Mr. President, there is something that troubles me when the argument to this effect is made. If this bill would not have been harmful to the Communist cause, why did they spend 17 years resisting it? Why did they challenge its constitutionality and why did they defy it from its inception? It does not make sense.

It seems to me that if it were not harmful, they would let it stay on the books and continue to be helped and have the constitutional rights of the majority of citizens of this country continue to be harmed. However, we know that has not been the history of this act.

In fact, the Albertson case was the culmination of many legal attacks upon the bill. It rendered the act defective as to the jurisdiction of the Board and its ability to function in the fashion which was envisioned by Congress.

It seems to me that we should address ourselves to the proposition: Have circumstances changed since 1950 so as to render this Board unnecessary or undesirable?

Contrary to what has been said in the Chamber or elsewhere, comprehensive hearings have been held on this subject.

There has been testimony, not only in committees of this body, but also in the other body, on the proposition advanced and on this bill in particular.

I shall refer to pages 1021 and 1077 in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, held in August of this year in connection with H.R. 10345, which is the bill providing appropriations for State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies. The testimony contained in those pages will

be very enlightening for anyone who wishes to peruse it. Certainly the testimony there will be found to bear upon all the principal propositions which are involved in this matter. I shall try to call attention to some of it.

The witnesses during those hearings included the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] who made a fine and illuminating presentation. Most of the testimony was directed to the proposition that the Board's appropriations request was premature and should not be considered until the status of the Board was determined, and whether Congress reaffirmed and renewed its charter of operations in light of the Supreme Court decisions.

The Senator from Wisconsin made a splendid case. We appreciated very much the points of view he presented. By "we" I mean his colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am one. I am also a member of that subcommittee which was holding hearings on these appropriations where this testimony was admitted. Other witnesses were J. W. Yeagley, Assistant Attorney General of the Department of Justice, and John W. Mahan, Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that hearings held before the Appropriations Subcommittee were not on this bill; that the bill was not before them; that the text of the bill was not before them; that they had knowledge a bill was pending in the Committee on the Judiciary, but neither the witnesses nor the members of the committee considered the specific bill now before the Senate at that time?

Mr. HRUSKA. I will say that the contrary is true. The provisions of this particular bill were considered. Mr. Mahan testified on them and so did Mr. Yeagley, as I shall demonstrate shortly, in referring to their testimony.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that the bill was not before the Appropriations Committee. The bill was not considered. Not one witness testified for even 1 minute on it. And the Senator from Nebraska knows it. The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee did not and could not consider the crucial issue in this bill, to wit that the Subversive Activities Control Board will not be able to act at all under this bill unless the Attorney General initiates action before the Board. There was no opportunity for the Subcommittee on Appropriations to determine from Mr. Yeagley, who is a representative of the Department of Justice, whether, in fact, the Attorney General would use the legislation that is now before the Senate to provide any substance, meaning, or activity for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is true to this extent: Mr. Yeagley was asked whether or not he considered this bill—and we were deep in consideration of its specific provisions when this question was asked—and the restructuring of this Board to be desirable. He deferred because the Attorney General and the Department of Jus-

tice had not yet rendered an opinion or judgment on the bill.

However, as we progressed in the testimony he covered these propositions one by one and said if the bill were enacted into law, the mission of the Board could be achieved and would be achieved if it were properly administered.

On the matter of whether the Department of Justice has an opinion, I shall leave that point to the senior Senator from Illinois, who has a communication from the Department of Justice signed by the Attorney General, which will bear on that point. I shall defer to him on that score.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On page 1076 Mr. Yeagley was asked about the effect of the proposed law on the Subversive Activities Control Board and he said:

In reference to the possible volume of business that might be placed before the Board if the law is changed, we would have to see the bill or law to say there would be no more cases or a lot of cases.

He was saying they have not seen the Dirksen bill, knew nothing about it, and was not in a position to judge if it would have any effect whether this Board would continue to be an idle sinecure or have activity. He made no comment.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct, and the law has been described by him. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] asked him on page 1066:

Senator McCLELLAN. Do you think the Board now should be strengthened by statutes, in view of the weakening of it by the Court decisions?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I don't like to dodge your question, Mr. Chairman, but the Department has not commented on the bills pending before the House.

That, I submit, is the answer of a loyal member of any department when its chief has not acted, pronounced judgment, or rendered a decision on the bill.

On the subject of whether circumstances have changed since 1950, at which time it was decided by Congress that we should have a mechanism of this kind to combat subversive activity, I suggest it would be highly pertinent to refer to some of the recent debates in the Chamber on East-West trade, the Consular Treaty with the Soviet Union, and others. In these debates the point was discussed in great detail that the essential basis and thrust of the Communist Party in the United States has not abated. It still continues and the position and programs of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union have not changed with reference to subversive activities in this country.

I think that case has been made. I shall not go into it at this time. However, I should like to refer to the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover, who testified before the House Appropriations Committee earlier this year.

Among other things, Mr. Hoover talked about the riots and disorders which have occurred in this country since 1964.

He said:

Although most of the riots and disturbances have been characterized by spontaneous outbursts of mob violence dominated by young hoodlums, involvement of other lawless, subversive, and extremist elements became readily apparent as the rioting grew and spread.

Further in his testimony, he said this:

Communists and other subversives and extremists strive and labor ceaselessly to precipitate racial trouble and take advantage of racial discord in this country. Such elements were active in exploiting and aggravating riots, for example, in Harlem, Watts, Cleveland, and Chicago.

Thus, I think that we are still at a point in our Nation's history when every legitimate problem and constitutional procedure should be taken for three major basic purposes: First, to properly and constitutionally identify those organizations which are Communist-action organizations and those which are Communist-front organizations.

The second step, of course, would be to expose them, so that the American people will know who and what they are and will be able to judge the origin of many of the actions which they take to accomplish their pernicious and subversive missions.

The third step—which is in the law—is to impose appropriate sanctions upon such organizations and persons who are identified with them. These sanctions would include: First, nonemployment in government; second, denial of certain tax-exempt characteristics which sometimes attach to non-profit organizations and third, the matter of being required in the case of any publication, whether by printing, by radio, or by television, to state that it is achieved by a Communist organization or a Communist-dominated organization. In this way we give the people of this Nation an opportunity to judge for themselves, on the basis of the origin of such material, whether they want to buy that particular point of view or whether they do not.

The question arises: Can the Board be abolished and its duties and activities assigned to the Department of Justice?

Obviously, Mr. President, that question almost answers itself, because the Board is required to make an adjudication. It is a quasi-judicial body. Under the present system the Attorney General presents a petition to the Board and makes certain allegations with reference either to a Communist action or to the Communist-front characteristics of a given organization, and says "We want the Board to make the finding that this organization is in one or the other of these classes."

It is the Department of Justice that makes the investigation. It is the Department of Justice that decides to prosecute. It is the Department of Justice that is the prosecutor.

One of the requirements of the constitutional due process, is that there not be that objectionable combination of duties of investigator, prosecutor, and judge.

In this case, the Subversive Activities Control Board is the judge. Mr. Yeagley covered this point very well at the hearings before the Appropriations Committee when this question was asked and the following answer was given:

Senator McCLELLAN. If this is abolished—

That is the Board—

can the board supplement and be complementary to the functions of the Justice Department and render an effective and valid service to our Government?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I don't believe the Justice Department would want these functions. I believe they are a part of the prosecutive arm of the Government. We would be the prosecutor, jury, and judge, I suppose.

That question, as I say, whether the Board can be dispensed with and its duties transferred to the Department of Justice, virtually answers itself.

The Board, during its lifetime, has acted upon 70 cases. On pages 1054 to 1057 in the Senate appropriation hearings there is a reference to a list of those cases and their general classification, how they arose, the individual proceedings before the Subversive Activities Control Board, the organization proceedings, and so forth.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the step-by-step procedural handling of these cases before the Board. It will be found in the hearings on pages 1051 and 1052.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD STEP-BY-STEP HANDLING OF CASES

1. The parties to proceedings before the Board, are in most instances, the Attorney General of the United States, designated as "petitioner," and an organization or individual, designated as "respondent."

2. The Attorney General files his petition with clerk of Board. Clerk enters in docket and sends respondent a copy of the Board's rules of procedure.

3. Full Board meets and considers and hears oral argument where indicated with respect to any preliminary motions filed by the parties, such as a motion by respondent to dismiss, or for particulars. (Board's rules fix time within which preliminary motions may be filed.)

4. Respondent files an answer to the Attorney General's petition. In some cases the Board holds a prehearing conference with attorneys for the parties prior to fixing the time and place of hearings for the purpose of taking evidence. Absent a prehearing conference, or following it if one is held, the Board meets and issues an order fixing the time and place for hearings and designating the hearing officer.

5. Evidentiary hearings are conducted either by the full Board, one or more members of the Board sitting as hearing officers, or by a hearing examiner designated by the Board. (The Board does not now have any hearing examiners.)

6. Following hearings, the parties are given the opportunity to file proposed findings of fact and briefs on legal questions. Where hearings are not conducted by the full Board, the hearing officer prepares and issues a recommended decision.

7. Both sides are given the opportunity to file exceptions to the recommended decision and to be heard thereon by the full Board.

8. Board issues written findings of fact and an appropriate order. There is a statutory right of the aggrieved party to judicial review. Board is a party to litigation on judicial review.

9. Where full Board conducts the evidentiary hearings there is no recommended decision. The Board issues its decision based upon the evidence and proposed findings and briefs submitted by the parties.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the order of the step-by-step procedures had suffered a very severe change and necessity for adjustment because of the Supreme Court decision in the *Albertson* case. The present law provides that the Board cannot take the steps of exposing and disclosing, and imposing appropriate sanc-

tions, until there has been self-registration by the kind of organization which is prescribed in the law. The Supreme Court in the *Albertson* case stated that self-registration is unconstitutional. Thus, some means must be devised whereby the Board can function in order to achieve the stated mission described in the law without the step of self-registration. Any amendment that is made of the present act along that line must be within constitutional requirements. The bill before us, S. 2171, seeks to do this. In my judgment, it does so in a fashion which will satisfy constitutional requirements.

By way of illustration, I would like to invite the attention of this honorable body to several specific provisions. For example, section 3 eliminates the requirements that Communist-action and front organizations must register themselves by repealing sections 7 and 8 of the act.

Section 4 revises section 9 of the act, which relates to the keeping of public registers of organizations and individuals that come within the terms of the act. Because of the elimination of compulsory registration—this is the self-registration to which I referred a minute ago—section 4 of the pending bill provides that it will be the Board, instead of the Attorney General, that will maintain public records giving information on organizations and individuals that have finally been determined to be of a type defined in the act. It adds Communist-infiltrated organizations to make the system of disclosure complete.

Section 5 makes changes in section 10 of the act relating to identifying as emanating from a Communist organization its publications or sponsored radio and TV programs. This section is needed because of the elimination, again, of the compulsory registration provision now contained in the law. This section also adds language to guard against possible unconstitutional interpretation of this amendment.

Section 6 makes changes in section 11(a) of the present act, which relates to the denial of tax deductions for contributions made to or for the use of any action or front organization. Section 6 is needed because of the elimination of compulsory registration as a part of that present law.

Section 7 is the same as the preceding section, but it is applicable to section 11(b) of the act relating to claims for tax exemptions by Communist organizations.

Section 8 revises section 12(e) (2) of the act relating to the Board's duty to determine who are members of action organizations. This amendment is likewise needed because of the elimination of compulsory registration for action organizations.

Section 9(a) revises section 13(a) of the act, which relates to proceedings before the Board to provide for proceedings for determinations whether organizations are Communist-action or Communist-front rather than for orders requiring such organizations to register.

Section 9(b) revises section 13(b) of the act relating to the right of organizations and individuals to obtain relief

from the continued application of the provisions of the act to them. It also provides means for organizations and individuals once determined under the new disclosure scheme to come within the act to have their status redetermined. The procedures in that action are simplified.

Section 9(c) revises that part of section 13(d) (2) of the act which now authorizes issuance of a registration order by default if an accused organization fails to appear at a hearing. It also provides that the Board shall proceed to receive evidence and then make an appropriate determination. This is to guard against the possible holding that the present provision denies due process. It retains authority for the Board to deny a redetermination without taking evidence if the organization or individual seeking it does not appear.

Sections 9 (d) through (g) are technical to conform the provisions for written findings and orders of the Board to the scheme of determinations rather than registration.

Section 9(k) provides for publication of final determinations of the Board. This is a technical change in section 13(k) of the act because of the elimination of Board orders requiring registration.

Section 10 revises section 14(a) of the act relating to the authority of the courts to require the Board to enter orders determining that an organization or individual no longer comes within the provisions of the act. This is to conform with the new approach of determinations rather than registration orders.

Section 11 assures the continuing in effect of determinations already made by the Board in the form of registration orders by authorizing the Board to modify such orders to conform with the new provisions. It also authorizes modifying any actions pending in the Board or the courts to conform with the new approach to disclosing and restricting activities of Communist organizations and individuals.

It is the judgment of this Senator that these provisions will not only be constitutional, but will enable the Subversive Activities Control Board to achieve the mission contained in the act.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator started his very persuasive speech this afternoon, as I understand it, by saying that while President Truman had indicated the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 would adversely affect the rights of American citizens, we have had 17 years' experience under this act, and it has not done so.

Is it not true that this act has done nothing, in effect? President Truman might well have been proved right if the bill had ever had any effect. But it has not. It has literally done nothing. The Senator from Nebraska has said that the Board has acted on 70 cases. Will the Senator enlighten us as to a single individual or a single organization that has been registered under this act? And the very heart of this act is registration. If there is no registration, there is virtually

no effect. And, of course, the rights and duties of our citizens are not protected if it does not work.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Wisconsin again demonstrates his ability to get at the heart of the matter. The question is, What good has it done? It has done this good: Out of those 70, 15 organizations were abandoned. When disclosure was threatened, they ceased to do business and dissolved, according to the testimony before the Appropriations Committee. There was sufficient testimony given in the trial of the *Albertson* case, and most of the 70 cases, by publicity and the facts and circumstances brought out, to apprise the American people of just what these organizations were.

And, of course, the fact that the act was considered so harmful to the Communists caused them to engage in the 17-year battle to stultify its declared mission. It seems to me we ought to take judicial notice, or at least legislative notice, of the fact that this act hurts. Through disclosure, exposure, and the imposition of certain sanctions, against the members and organizations, the act hurts the Communist cause in this country. That is why we find them fighting so hard and tenaciously until they were finally successful in getting one section of the act declared unconstitutional.

I say to my colleagues that this fact should be weighed heavily on the proposition of whether or not this Board should be continued and its declared mission reaffirmed by this body.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to my good friend from Nebraska that, once again, what this Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 required was registration of subversive organizations; a listing of the members in the registration; and an indication of where the money was coming from that kept the organizations going—for all of which information one could make a strong case. But as long as not one single organization is registered, the act has not accomplished its mission. It has not done its job. It has secured no information.

These organizations come and go. It is not surprising that some of them have gone out of existence in the last 15 years. But the fundamental purpose of the legislation, which was to require registration, has not been achieved.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator forgets that registration of these organizations by their own officials is only one part of the process.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It triggers the rest of it.

Mr. HRUSKA. The real mission of the Board is to identify, expose, and disclose the organizations, once it is properly determined by the Board, in a quasi-judicial procedure, with the right of appeal, that they are Communist or Communist-front organizations. But registration is only one part of the process. That is only one part of the process in the ultimate mission and goal of the Board.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I ask, if this was only one main purpose of the bill, why does not the Board do something? For the last 20 months this Board has not done anything—literally nothing. The Board says it cannot require sub-

versives to register; that they cannot proceed under the Supreme Court decision; that it would be in violation of the fifth amendment to require these organizations and groups to register.

They have done nothing. They have had no hearings. They have conducted no investigations.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the answer is simple. The Supreme Court said that they must not use and depend upon self-registration of these organizations. There is only one way for the case to get before the Board, under the present law, and that is through this process of registration. Being stultified in that area, of course, the Board could not accomplish its purpose. The purpose of the present bill is to provide a way other than registration for these cases to get before the Board.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with all that the Senator has said.

Mr. HRUSKA. Of anyone who is opposing this measure, some people might ask, "Don't you want these Communist organizations identified in a proper, constitutional, and orderly way?"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; indeed. The answer is clear. But we have no way of knowing whether this is a proper, constitutional, and legal way.

The Senator's speech this afternoon was a fine speech, as is always true of any speech by the Senator from Nebraska, one of the most able Members of this body. It impressed me as an excellent argument as to why we should have hearings on this bill.

This is a very difficult, delicate, constitutional problem. The Supreme Court has found the Subversive Activities Control Act, in effect, unconstitutional in its most important thrust. The Senator from Illinois has received from the Department of Justice some kind of mysterious letter; nobody knows what is in it—

Mr. HRUSKA. It is not mysterious, nor is it rarefied. It will be brought to the attention of the Senate in due time, by its sponsor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would like to see it.

Mr. HRUSKA. It will be brought to the attention of the Senator in due time. I hesitated to do so now only because I feel that would more appropriately be done by its author. It is a short letter, Mr. President.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But we do not have any testimony from the principal legal officer of this Government as to whether or not the proposal will work. When his representative came to speak before the Appropriations Subcommittee, he said they had not seen the bill, and had not had a chance to analyze it; they did not know whether it would do anything.

So all the testimony we have had was testimony given before the Attorney General had had a chance to analyze the bill or see it. To the best of my knowledge, he still has not seen it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the testimony of the Senator from Wisconsin was heard on August 15.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. It was on that date, and prior thereto, that the bill under

present consideration was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. The members of the Committee on the Judiciary had discussed it particularly those of us who serve on the Internal Security Subcommittee. The bill was actually under discussion, and had been acted upon, by that time. I would not want to make the statement that the members of the Committee on the Judiciary—the same Senators who sat in large number on the Appropriations Subcommittee—did not know anything about the bill. The bill grew out of the work and deliberations of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, what happened on that date does not make any sense to me. That was the most remarkable legislative day, in my judgment, in my experience in the Senate. In the 10 years I have been here, I have never seen anything like it. We had testimony that morning before that Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce. That same day, the same morning, the Committee on the Judiciary met and reported out this bill.

If this testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee was the basis of any finding by the Committee on the Judiciary, it must have been a remarkable demonstration of extrasensory perception, because it occurred at exactly the same time. There could not have been any kind of communication, because it was simultaneous.

And, of course, it is ridiculous to argue that the Appropriations Subcommittee could have any knowledge of the Judiciary Committee's executive deliberations which were going on at the same hour of the same day but in a different building. Modern printing of hearings and reports may be fast. But it is not that fast. It is not instantaneous and simultaneous.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator knows a bill does not just pop in to a committee and get reported.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That bill did.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is not something lighted like a match, and left to burn.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That surely happened in this case.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Albertson case had been discussed repeatedly in the Committee on the Judiciary since its rendition by the Supreme Court. The need for a bill such as this, with provisions that would be competent to overcome the obstacles rendered by the Albertson decision, had been discussed, and the bill had been drawn accordingly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not question that the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Illinois, and others are very able Senators and competent lawyers, and know what they are doing.

What I am complaining about is that we have no record, we have had no hearings, and a report consisting of only one page plus a copy of the Court's opinion, and nothing else to go on. I think we have received more information this afternoon from the distinguished Senator from Nebraska by far than we have had during all the deliberation and discussion on this bill.

While the Senator from Nebraska is

a very able man, I submit that even his analysis is no substitute for hearings, where we would have available competent people on both sides of the issue to discuss it and testify.

That is why it seems to me that the bill should be recommitted for a short time, and hearings held, and then acted upon. I have discussed the matter with other Senators who share my view, and under those circumstances, all of us would agree to a fixed date and time to vote on it.

I ask the Senator from Nebraska, why do we not do that, instead of being blind as to what is in this very complicated and important bill, which does affect constitutional rights and liberties?

The Senator from Nebraska and I are certainly agreed upon one thing, and that is that we must oppose communism, and oppose it as competently as possible, with our eyes open.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I think the answer to the Senator's question is that the issue is not complicated. A reading of the record which is available will provide all the essential elements necessary for a Senator to make a decision.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first three paragraphs of the opening statement of Mr. J. W. Yeagley, the Assistant Attorney General, as printed on page 1060 of the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Appropriations Subcommittee hearings, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

I do that, Mr. President, because those paragraphs state the basic purpose of this act.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the record of hearings was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF J. W. YEAGLEY, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The basic purpose of the Subversive Activities Control Act, enacted in September 1950, was disclosure: i.e., to bring into the open the activities of Communist-action and Communist-front organizations which had been free to hide behind the mask of anonymity, and also to identify members of the Communist Party.

A Communist-action organization is defined in the Act as an organization which (1) is substantially directed, dominated, and controlled by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement, and (2) operates primarily to advance the objectives of the world Communist movement.

A Communist-front organization is defined as one which (a) is substantially directed, dominated, and controlled by a Communist-action organization, and (b) is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist-action organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement.

Mr. HRUSKA. Unless we are prepared to say we want to repudiate this basic purpose of the parent act, and do nothing with it, or radically modify it, the issue is simple. One of the facets of the procedures which provided for the achievement of that basic purpose has been declared unconstitutional, the provision with reference to self-registration of the accused organization. All that needs to be done is provide another means to get such cases before the Board

for its determination and for further proceedings.

The issue is a very simple one. It is not so complicated that we would need a half dozen constitutional lawyers on each side to define it, and then send the matter back to the Supreme Court—where it will go again any way for another determination after a period of years.

The issue is simple. We ought to enact the bill into law, and send it on its way to another series of attacks by the Communist Party. The party is engaged in an effort to subvert this Government and to destroy it or if they cannot use the methods provided by our Constitution in the meantime to get those purposes accomplished.

Let us resort to a little commonsense, and get at the task of the day.

Mr. PROXMIER. I say again to my friend from Nebraska that this is a most extraordinary procedure. I cannot recall any case in which it has been said that we have plenty of testimony on the legislation, when we have none. What we have is some questions and answers on an entirely different committee dealing with a different matter. Specifically whether or not we should appropriate funds for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

This proposed legislation was not before the Appropriations Subcommittee. That was not the proper tribunal to act upon it, even if it had been before that subcommittee. There have been no hearings on the bill. It is a complicated, 13-page bill, and deals with a very complex part of our law, which has been found in large part, as the Senator from Nebraska has stated so well today, unconstitutional.

Yet we have been told, once by the Senator from Illinois and now by the Senator from Nebraska, that we do not need any more information, we do not need any constitutional experts to give us their advice.

Of course we do. This is the very heart of the legislative process. If we do not insist upon being informed by competent experts, when we have legislation before us, we are likely to enact and we deserve to have legislation which will be inadequate to serve the intended purpose.

It is especially important that we have legislation that is adequate. We know, as the Senator has so well stated, that this legislation may very well go before the Supreme Court and be the subject of litigation for years. It is most important that we get competent advice and draft the law in such a way that it will stand up and be effective, or we should not draft any legislation at all.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin is an able debator. He is a very able Senator, and I enjoy his presentations very much, particularly in colloquies of this kind. However, I call the attention of my colleagues to an inconsistency in his present argument. He says the bill ought to be recommitted for a short time so that the committee can hear the facts and evidence. Then, he says, we will then act on it.

Mr. President, we have that very evidence right here. I have never known the Senator from Wisconsin, nor most of

my colleagues, to depend upon form so much that they will insist upon form and send the bill back to the detriment of considering substance. I say again, and I say advisedly, that there is ample substance here.

Mr. President, I will read from page 1066 of the hearings, at which point Mr. Yeagley was being interrogated by the chairman of the subcommittee.

First, I ask unanimous consent that starting with the last two lines on page 1065 and extending over to the fourth paragraph from the bottom of page 1067 of the record be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator McCLELLAN. I am trying to find out if this Board is necessary. If it is not, we ought to abolish it.

COMMUNIST THREAT IN UNITED STATES

Mr. YEAGLEY. The Communist Party is still in existence in this country.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is it active?

Mr. YEAGLEY. It is active.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is it aggressively active?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I think Communists are more aggressive politically than most followers of other political creeds.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is there any doubt about its efforts at subversion in this country, in your judgment?

Mr. YEAGLEY. No; not at all, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. YEAGLEY. Right.

Senator McCLELLAN. Then, in your judgment, should there be an effort to combat it by exposure?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I believe that it offers an excellent means of attacking the Communist method in this country.

Senator McCLELLAN. Would you say that notwithstanding the adverse decisions of the Court respecting the work of and the findings of this Board in the number of cases, and the holding of part of the act creating the Board and its functions unconstitutional—would you say that this Board, on its record, has performed a valuable service, or that its services have not been of such consequences as to warrant its continuance, with the stripped powers it now has?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I believe it has performed a valuable service. And that is exactly the reason that the Department, I presume, filed the cases against the 44 members of the Communist Party and against the 23 front organizations. It was in order to obtain a beneficial result.

Senator McCLELLAN. Do you think the Board now should be strengthened by statutes, in view of the weakening of it by the Court decisions?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I don't like to dodge your question, Mr. Chairman, but the Department has not commented on the bills pending before the House.

Senator McCLELLAN. I am not asking you to comment on any particular bill. Do you feel maybe there is a need for the strengthening or redefining of the functions of the Board by legislation, in view of the Court decisions?

Mr. YEAGLEY. If it could be done and provide constitutional due process, right.

Senator McCLELLAN. Of course. But in other words what I am asking you in effect is: Should the Board be abolished, or should we keep it and try to revitalize it, in a sense, and strengthen its powers and functions, within the framework of the Constitution?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I certainly could not support anything in the form of abolishing the Board

because, as I have indicated, I feel it has been beneficial in the past. It has been valuable. I feel that there may be business in the future. I feel the Communist Party is a continuing threat as long as it is in existence and active here. And I know of no alternative in this area to the present functions of the Board.

THREAT DIMINUTION

Senator McCLELLAN. Let me ask you: Is the Communist Party more or less active now than in the past, in your judgment, as to subversive activities?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I would have to say it is less.

Senator McCLELLAN. It is less. What has contributed to the diminishing of its activities?

Mr. YEAGLEY. Probably there have been several factors. I don't know how much of an expert I am in this field. But the party has lost membership since the Second World War, maybe from 80,000 down to whatever it is today. It has been estimated at from 8,000 to 10,000. This has been a continuing drop, particularly after, say, 1948 or 1950 on down.

U.S. ECONOMY AND BOARD EFFECTS

Obviously, we must recognize that the improved economic factors in the country have given the Communists less ammunition. I personally have felt that the exposure involved in these Board proceedings, particularly, as I have indicated, as to the 23 front organizations, the exposure in the original case against the Communist Party, in which voluminous evidence was given as to its purposes and its foreign control, have all been highly detrimental to the party. And I can advise the committee, as I believe you may have been informed before, that the leaders of the Communist Party themselves have been of the opinion over the years that the functions of this Board have been highly detrimental to their organization.

Senator McCLELLAN. That is your belief and your findings?

Mr. YEAGLEY. That is right.

Senator McCLELLAN. Well, if this Board has contributed to the lessening of Communist activities and Communist effectiveness in its purpose of subversion and so forth in this country, then it is your belief as I understand it that because of that effectiveness and its potential usefulness in the future it should not be abolished?

Mr. YEAGLEY. That is my view.

Mr. HRUSKA. At the beginning of this colloquy Senator McCLELLAN asked the following questions and received the following answers:

Senator McCLELLAN. I am trying to find out if this Board is necessary. If it is not, we ought to abolish it.

COMMUNIST THREAT IN UNITED STATES

Mr. YEAGLEY. The Communist Party is still in existence in this country.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is it active?

Mr. YEAGLEY. It is active.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is it aggressively active?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I think Communists are more aggressive politically than most followers of other political creeds.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is there any doubt about its efforts at subversion in this country, in your judgment?

Mr. YEAGLEY. No; not at all, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. YEAGLEY. Right.

If we go through all of this testimony, Mr. President, we find that there is not any question as to the necessity for recommitment, nor any question that the type of amendment of the law contained in S. 2171 will not do the job.

There is ample substance here upon

which the Senate should go forward with the consideration of the pending bill to favorable approval.

The right of appeal from decisions of the Board is preserved, and all of the niceties, to which Communists seem sometimes to be treated with even a greater generosity than other litigants, are all protected by this act. And the objectionable part, or that part which was held to be objectionable in the judgment of the Supreme Court, has been removed. The procedures have been adjusted, and it will be an effective bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I have one very brief point to make in connection with the fine presentation of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

I think this is by far the most useful discussion I have heard yet of the pending bill. The Senator from Nebraska characteristically confined himself to the issue and spoke very pertinently about the legislation.

I emphasize the fact, however, that the only record we have is not related to the bill, but concerns whether Congress should appropriate additional funds this year for the Subversive Activities Control Board. That is a related issue, but it is not a principal issue.

One of the best examples of that is that even the Senator from Nebraska, able as he is, concluded his remarks by quoting as a statement by Mr. Yeagley in answer to Senator McCLELLAN to the effect that the Communist Party is still active, aggressively active, and more aggressive politically than most followers of other political creeds. The Senator from Nebraska apparently feels this is the heart of the matter. In fact it is wholly irrelevant.

We know the Communist Party is a threat to this country. All of us know this. We want to know how we can effectively, I stress effectively combat it. We do not want to pass another bill which will do nothing for 17 years and then be found unconstitutional.

We want legislation that will stand up. We say that we cannot have legislation that will stand up on tough constitutional issues in the Supreme Court when the only record is a record of testimony not before the Appropriations Committee on the bill, but before the Appropriations Committee on the question of whether appropriations should be made for the Board, and not whether this particular legislation will do the job.

Whether the particular legislation will do the job, or even begin to do the job, depends on many things. It depends on the considered and detailed conclusions of the Attorney General of the United States. We do not have a scrap of evidence on that question before us.

That is why it seems to me perfectly logical and proper for us to return the pending legislation to the Judiciary Committee to secure hearings.

I conclude by pointing out that the court decision which made the Board moot and made it necessary for us to reconsider the Subversive Activities Control Act is an action of the Supreme Court taken a year and a half ago. It took a year and a half to get around to

introducing legislation and getting it on the floor.

They now want us to whip the bill through in a few days. They say the bill cannot be recommitted for hearings because it might delay the legislation. With a bill given as transparently inadequate consideration as this one.

That does not make any sense to me.

I hope the Senate will send the pending bill back for hearings without any delay, with a unanimous-consent agreement committing us to a vote as of a certain time on this matter so we can vote on this bill with our eyes open.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I know the Senator will not deny me the opportunity of rebuttal.

We have had 17 months since the decision in the Albertson case. Nothing has been done.

We now have people who want to add further to the period of time in which we have delayed action on the pending bill. It is unconscionable to delay longer.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am greatly concerned that while we are sending men to fight a war against Communists 10,000 miles away, we are not fighting communism as hard and effectively as we should be in our own country. It is a great disappointment to me that in the 17 years since we passed the Internal Security Law of 1950, which required all Communists to register or go to jail, not a single Communist has been forced to register or pay the penalty for not registering.

Through a series of Supreme Court decisions in their favor the Communists have been so successful in avoiding prosecution under that law and they have become so bold that they held a national convention in New York last year and announced they will have a candidate for President of the United States in 1968.

For some time, the Communist Party has been involved in anti-American activities in this country that are calculated to hinder the war effort and to disrupt our society. The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, told a congressional committee recently that the FBI has approximately 150 known or suspected Communist front or Communist-infiltrated organizations under active investigation. He said further, that one of the primary recruiting targets of the Communist Party is the youth of America and that the Party has continued its intensified program aimed and directed at our youth. It is common knowledge, admitted by university officials and reported in the press, that the Communists were involved in many of the student rebellions that have rocked our campuses in recent months.

Mr. Hoover stated also that the Communists have either started or have been active in every major demonstration against the men in Vietnam. They have been particularly active in stop the bombing demonstrations.

There is a definite Communist move on in South and Central America.

I know of no problem more urgent than controlling communism in the United States, for if we are to send our

men into battle halfway around the world to oppose the spread of communism, we certainly should do everything within our power to stop it here in our own country.

This threat in the next 10 years may prove to be more serious than any international problem, so-called, that we may have. It is absolutely necessary that we take all steps possible to strengthen the law and stop Communist activity in this country. They will not overcome us, nor be able to infiltrate us successfully; but their attempt to do so may prove to be one of the gravest and most far reaching problems we have on the home front.

We should pass this bill now, and also follow through until it becomes the law of the land. Then our interest should continue by insisting and urging the enforcement of its terms to the utmost by the Department of Justice.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 17, 1967, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 16, 1967:

U.S. JUDGE

Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge for the fifth circuit, vice a new position, Public Law 89-372 approved March 18, 1966.

U.S. ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE

Jerre S. Williams, of Texas, to be Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, for a term of 5 years.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers of the Coast Guard in the grade of Lieutenant (junior grade):

William W. Peterman	Donnie D. Polk
James B. Ellis II	Jonathan Collom
Charles W. Gower	William E. Fox, Jr.
Gerald D. Sickafoose	Harry W. Tiffany
Stephen L. Anthony	William H. Stockton II
John H. Hanna III	Benjamin M. Chiswell
Robert J. Faucher	III
Harold E. Millan, Jr.	Peter A. Gabele
John C. Maxham	Kenneth J. Allington
John F. Milbrand	John G. Busavage
Steven L. Benson	Robert C. Byrd
Dennis J. Shaw	Donald H. Van Liew
Michael C. Grace	Paul A. Flood
Thomas G. Deville	John E. Lord
Richard E. Peyser	Paul B. Withstandley
Thomas M. Dunn	II
Joseph R. Hoosty	Charles O. Laughary,
Robert S. Duncan, Jr.	Jr.
Philip J. Grossweller	Anthony C. Alejandro
John C. Carney, Jr.	John E. Shkor
Thomas R. Dickey	Joseph O. Bernard
Kenneth E. Williams	Stanley Winslow
Edward A. Hemstreet	Leslie M. Meekins
William K. May	Eric J. Stuart
Harry H. Dudley	Dennis R. Freezer
Jose E. Rodrigues	Douglas W. Crowell
Gary B. Johnson	John R. Felton
Nesbit C. Lofton	Douglas F. Gehring
Robert W. Mueller	Gary L. Cousins
Jerald H. Heinz	Donald B. Wittschiebe
Edward C. Cummings	Donald P. Murphy
III	Edward J. Barrett

Roswell W. Ard, Jr.
 Ronald J. Marafioti
 Richard P. Oswitt
 Michael T. Bohlman
 Edward J. Jason
 John E. Byrnes, Jr.
 John L. Parker
 John D. Bannan
 Raymond E. Beyler, Jr.
 Alphons R. Melis III
 Walter L. John
 Thomas H. Robinson
 Gerald L. Underwood
 Adrian W. Longacre
 Vernon C. Hipkiss
 David A. Jones
 Patrick V. Kauffold
 Jeffery J. Hamilton
 William A. Kucharski, Jr.
 Earl A. Blanton
 Raymond A. Ross
 Robert J. Philpott
 Richard W. Wright
 Philip J. Cardaci
 Ronald C. Mers
 William H. Hawley III
 Stephen A. Kull
 Michael W. Taylor
 William A. Lehmann
 Raymond B. Freeman
 Jack S. Webb
 Paul E. Busick
 Furman S. Baldwin, Jr.
 Thomas R. Roche III
 Anthony R. Carbone
 Kenneth C. Hollemon
 Robert G. Keary
 Robert L. Barnes
 Allan P. Fulton
 Leo A. Morehouse, Jr.
 Harvey G. Knuth III
 Imanis J. Leskinovitch
 Edwin M. Cox
 Harold F. Hoppe
 Warren E. Miller, Jr.
 Donald A. Winchester
 Theodore B. Kichline
 James T. Read
 Merle J. Smith, Jr.
 Dennis W. Parker

Gary R. Wilkins
 Charles A. Vedder
 Charles H. Lancaster
 Marvin L. Beaty
 Dwight C. Broga III
 William L. Engleson, Sr.
 William E. Jones
 Gerald T. Victor
 Donald W. Troutt
 Dewain D. Clark
 Joseph J. Kennedy
 Warren W. Johns
 Kenneth L. Norton
 George F. Cole
 Charles M. Montanese, Jr.
 Walter D. Eddowes III
 Dixon C. Elder
 Jon J. McNutt
 Jay D. Crouthers
 Robert J. Opezio
 Ray C. Gregory
 Robert P. Relchersamer
 Peter L. Ehrman
 Nevin A. Pealer
 George C. Van Natta
 Ronald D. Blendu
 Kenneth G. Coder
 Benjamin E. Norbom
 Daniel D. Mazurowski
 William G. Bradford III
 Richard G. Hendrickson
 John G. Carroll, Jr.
 Frederick K. Farner
 Clifford E. Clayton, Jr.
 Barry E. Chambers
 Edward M. Goodwin III
 Joseph T. Oskolski
 James L. Middleton
 Keith E. Nichols
 Gary D. Haubold
 James G. Lester
 Oscar F. Poppe, Jr.
 Michael F. Keating
 Henry C. Post
 Edwin A. Coolbaugh
 Dillard J. Tucker
 Marcus L. Lowe

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Glenn Charles Ames, O328307, Adjutant General's Corps.
 Brig. Gen. Erbon Wilbur Wise, O1280066, Adjutant General's Corps.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Laurence Bernard Adams, Jr., O396091, Adjutant General's Corps.
 Col. James Harold Biddy, O390683, Adjutant General's Corps.
 Col. Floyd Leonard Edsall, O555952, Adjutant General's Corps.
 Col. Jack Kendall Elrod, O2091158, Adjutant General's Corps.
 Col. Albert Lee Lemen, O391248, Adjutant General's Corps.
 Col. Van Daley Nunally, Jr., O1167144, Adjutant General's Corps.
 Col. Salvador Teodoro Roig, O268080, Adjutant General's Corps.
 Col. Charles Henry Wilson, O485619, Adjutant General's Corps.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy are nominated for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

COMMANDER, LINE

Abelein, Herman C.
 Ackerman, Eugene B.
 Ackerman, Warren J.

Ackley, Richard T.
 Allen, James A.
 Allison, Paul

Allmann, Richard R.
 Ambrose, John E.
 Anderson, Robert G.
 Andresen, Ronald N.
 Andrews, Jack B.
 Angelman, Cornell C.
 Anglim, Daniel F., Jr.
 Anthony, John D., Jr.
 Archer, Martin D.
 Arnold, Henry D.
 Arnold, William S. M.
 Ashmore, Jackie K.
 Ashworth, Albert R., Jr.
 Aslund, Roland E.
 Aumack, Robert F.
 Ausbrooks, Erskine P., Jr.
 Austin, Fuller A.
 Axell, Charles L.
 Ayres, William H., Jr.
 Baarstad, David E.
 Bacheller, Frank E.
 Backstrom, Robert I.
 Baggett, Lee, Jr.
 Baggett, Talmadge S.
 Bailey, Henry G.
 Bailey, William C.
 Bain, Robert
 Baker, Norman K.
 Barkalow, Gerald H.
 Barker, Franklin H.
 Barker, Harold D.
 Barker, Raymond H.
 Barnard, Ralph E.
 Barnard, Robert W.
 Barnett, Curtis L.
 Barrineau, Edwin
 Barron, Joseph M.
 Bates, George M.
 Baty, Edward M.
 Bauernfeind, Joseph H.
 Bauman, Charles J., Jr.
 Beck, Frederic E., Jr.
 Beesley, Howard L.
 Bellar, Fred J., Jr.
 Belter, Robert H.
 Benn, Joseph W., Jr.
 Bennett, Robert W.
 Bennett, Robert E.
 Bennie, Ralph F.
 Bergman, Daniel
 Bergstrom, James H.
 Berthier, Neil E.
 Bickel, William B.
 Bigenho, Roy M.
 Bigley, Thomas J.
 Billings, Randall K.
 Bippus, Henry
 Bircher, William B.
 Blaha, Albert J.
 Blalock, David H., Jr.
 Blas, Richard R.
 Block, Peter F.
 Blough, Arthur K., Jr.
 Boeing, Charles E.
 Boggs, Gilbert A.
 Borgstrom, Charles O., Jr.
 Bornier, James A.
 Boston, Leo
 Bowers, Thomas L.
 Bowersox, Earl C., Jr.
 Boyd, David S.
 Braddy, Don L., Jr.
 Bradford, James
 Bradford, John W., Jr.
 Brainard, Donald R.
 Bramley, Leslie G.
 Branch, Alvin D.
 Brand, Alvin
 Brandenburg, Delbert E.
 Branson, John J., Jr.
 Brick, John H.
 Briggs, Douglas W.
 Bristol, Edward R., Jr.
 Brown, Bruce W.
 Brown, Charles "D"

Brown, James W.
 Bruce, Forrest T.
 Brumbach, Lawrence E.
 Buck, Roger L.
 Buffkin, John W., Jr.
 Burden, James D.
 Burnett, James G.
 Burt, Alexander R., Jr.
 Bush, Charles L.
 Bustard, Francis W.
 Buteau, Bernard L.
 Byron, John B.
 Cady, John P., Jr.
 Caglione, Joseph, Jr.
 Caldwell, Ronald H.
 Calhoun, William P.
 Cameron, Allan K., Jr.
 Campbell, James S.
 Canaan, Gerald C.
 Carberry, James P., Jr.
 Cariker, Jess L., Jr.
 Carius, Robert W.
 Carlson, George R.
 Carlton, George A.
 Carpenter, Malcolm S.
 Carr, William K.
 Carraway, Terry F.
 Carter, Earl L.
 Carter, Frank R.
 Casey, Edward J., Jr.
 Cassilly, Frank R.
 Cawley, Thomas J.
 Cedarburg, Owen L.
 Chambers, John J.
 Chanaud, Henry L.
 Chapman, George T., Jr.
 Choyce, Charles V.
 Christensen, Charles S., Jr.
 Church, Clifford E., Jr.
 Church, George A.
 Clark, Fred P., Jr.
 Clark, Willard H., Jr.
 Clarke, John R.
 Clemens, Porter E.
 Clubb, Reginald D.
 Cochran, James A.
 Coffman, Walter W.
 Cogdell, John B.
 Cole, Charles W.
 Coleman, Frank S.
 Coleman, Gerard G.
 Colleary, John E., Jr.
 Colvin, Robert D.
 Compton, Bryan W., Jr.
 Conkey, Carlton G.
 Connolly, Robert D.
 Cook, Carroll T.
 Cook, Richard M.
 Coontz, Robert J.
 Cooper, Carleton R.
 Cooper, David L.
 Cossaboom, William M., II
 Costello, Daniel J.
 Costello, Peter M., Jr.
 Coughlin, John T.
 Covington, Gerald E.
 Cowhill, William J.
 Cowperthwaite, John K.
 Cramblett, Frank
 Crosby, Russell U.
 Cross, Daniel F.
 Crow, Edwin M.
 Crowl, Otho W.
 Cruise, Donald A.
 Cunningham, Russell P., Jr.
 Dagg, Robert M.
 Daly, Norman F.
 Davey, Richard B.
 Davidson, Harrison W., Jr.
 Davidson, Richard S.
 Davis, Allen B.
 Davis, Jack W.
 Davis, Ralph O.
 Davis, William J.

Day, Lawrence C.
 Defelice, Edward A.
 Dellinger, Chesley Y., Jr.
 Delozier, Richard G.
 Demers, William H., II
 DeWitt, Duane D.
 Denmark, George T.
 Dennis, Edwin L., Jr.
 DeWitt, Duane D.
 Dickens, Richard A.
 Diehl, William F.
 Doak, Samuel L.
 Doan, Richard C.
 Draddy, John M.
 Dreesen, Robert F.
 Driscoll, Jerome M.
 Driscoll, William T., Jr.
 Dufort, Emile J., Jr.
 Duggan, Frederick F., Jr.
 Duggan, Richard W., II
 Dukes, Warren C.
 Dunaway, Gene T.
 Dunbar, John P.
 Duncan, Richard D.
 Dunn, Neville D.
 Dunning, Frederick S., Jr.
 Eagye, Thomas R., II
 East, George W.
 Eckerd, George E.
 Eckert, Earl J., Jr.
 Eckhout, Wilmont S.
 Edwards, Frederick A., Jr.
 Ehleringer, Henry G.
 Elliott, James D.
 Ellis, James L.
 Ellison, LeRoy S.
 Ellsworth, William A.
 Emerson, David F.
 Emlet, Harold B.
 Engel, Paul H.
 Engle, Raymond E.
 Erikson, Warren W.
 Estabrook, Robert K.
 Estes, Leland F.
 Estes, Windom L.
 Fahland, Frank R.
 Falkenstein, Rudolph F.
 Farrell, John B.
 Farrell, John R.
 Faulkenberry, Virgil T.
 Feagin, Frederick K.
 Fears, Donald G.
 Featherston, Frank H.
 Felt, Harry H., Jr.
 Fenno, Eric N.
 Ferrucci, David E.
 Finley, Alden G.
 Finley, Hugh D.
 Fleming, Francis L., Jr.
 Fletcher, James L.
 Flynn, Richard E.
 Foley, Sylvester R., Jr.
 Forbes, Donald K.
 Forster, William G.
 Forsythe, Forrest
 Foster, James R.
 Foster, Ralph W., Jr.
 Foster, Raymond H.
 Foucht, Richard A.
 Fox, Albert D.
 Fox, Richard T.
 Fraasa, Donald G.
 French, Jack T.
 French, Robert D.
 Freytag, David R.
 Friesen, Edwin "J"
 Frudden, Mark P.
 Gaddis, George E.
 Gaddy, James K.
 Gallagher, Lawrence E.
 Gardner, Richard G.
 Garland, John C.
 Garrett, Everett C.
 Geist, Richard A.

Geitz, Kenneth L.
 Gercken, Otto E.
 Gibbons, Paul G., Jr.
 Gilbertson, John E.
 Gilpin, Burton H.
 Gire, Harold W.
 Gobble, George F.
 Goldbeck, Lewis H., Jr.
 Goldman, Howard A.
 Goode, Martin
 Gooding, Niles R., Jr.
 Goodwin, Edmund E.
 Graf, Harry R.
 Green, John N.
 Green, Richard W.
 Greene, John L.
 Gregory, George T.
 Grigg, William H.
 Grimm, William F.
 Groff, Bruce F.
 Grosvenor, Alexander G. B.
 Grunwald, Edward A.
 Guffey, Elton E.
 Gulon, Joseph E.
 Gureck, William A.
 Hage, Lealand P.
 Hall, Berkeley W.
 Hall, Timothy K.
 Halleland, Henry L.
 Hallett, Edward R.
 Hamer, Robert R., Jr.
 Hamm, Warren C., Jr.
 Hampton, Charles T.
 Hanson, Carl T.
 Hanson, Elighue G., Jr.
 Hardgrave, James B., Sr.
 Hardy, Martin E.
 Harkness, Vinton O., Jr.
 Harris, Richard D.
 Harris, Robert D., Jr.
 Hart, Stephen L.
 Hartigan, Richard B.
 Haselton, Waring B., Jr.
 Hassman, Andrew U., Jr.
 Hausler, Carl O.
 Hawk, James T.
 Hawkins, Larry L.
 Hays, Ronald J.
 Heerwagen, David D.
 Hegrat, Donald M.
 Henry, Martin H.
 Herbert, Thomas J.
 Herrin, Holden R.
 Hicks, Lawrence F.
 Higginbotham, Leonard H.
 Highberg, Roy W.
 Hill, Allen E.
 Hill, Howard A.
 Hilscher, Carl C.
 Hinsen, Kenneth L.
 Hirstein, Robert V.
 Hoare, Robert E.
 Hoffman, Robert D.
 Hofstra, Edward J.
 Hoganson, John H.
 Hohn, Henry E.
 Holman, Rockwell
 Holmes, John S.
 Holt, Robert E.
 Hoover, Matthew V.
 Hopf, Elwood J.
 Hopkins, Clifford D.
 Hopkins, Mark, Jr.
 Hornbeck, Donald R.
 Hosemann, Leland J.
 Hubbs, Donald R.
 Huff, Mahlon S.
 Hughes, Frank W., Jr.
 Hughes, Ray S.
 Hughes, Wayne L.
 Hugo, William P.
 Humphries, George P.
 Hunsley, Lindel A., II
 Hurd, Russell E.

- Hussman, Harry L., III
Huth, Ralph L.
Iredale, John P.
Jameson, James N.
Jarrell, Donald L.
Jeffries, Claude E., Jr.
Jenkins, Paul J.
Jenkins, Ralph A.
Jennings, John S.
Jensen, Arlo J.
Jensen, Donald L.
Jensen, Wayne L.
Jermann, Donald R.
Jesse, Harold W.
Jimmerson, Thomas J., Jr.
Johns, Arthur J.
Johnson, Dale C.
Johnson, Daniel C.
Johnson, Homer R.
Johnson, Ian J.
Johnson, Merlin L.
Johnson, Richard "D"
Johnson, Richard C.
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Willard E.
Johnston, Frederick B.
Jones, Cecil B., Jr.
Jones, John P.
Jones, Ray P.
Jordan, Watt W., Jr.
Kaiser, Robert D.
Kamrad, Joseph G.
Katz, Martin
Kaufman, Richard E.
Kaune, James E.
Kearney, John R.
Kelly, Ronald T.
Kelly, William P., Jr.
Kempf, Cecil J.
Kennedy, James R., Jr.
Kersch, Roger N.
Ketchmark, Gilles J.
Kidd, Owen A.
Kiehl, William A.
Kiker, Herbert W., Jr.
King, Robert A.
King, William R.
Kingery, Samuel G.
Kingsbury, Ben P.
Kirkhorn, Robert L.
Kirkpatrick, Darrell F.
Kivlen, Alexander L.
Kjeldgaard, Peter D.
Klabo, Richard T.
Kluga, Norbert R.
Koch, Richard A.
Kolstad, Tom I.
Kost, John D., Jr.
Kramer, George
Kramer, Robert P.
Krantzman, Harry M.
Kraus, Rudolf L.
Kreinberg, Alfred G.
Kremer, John L.
Kretschman, Frank C.
Krohn, Stanley W.
Kunkle, Floyd S., Jr.
Larry, Walter C.
Lasell, Max H.
Lasley, William W.
Lassen, William V.
Lassiter, Will E.
Lawrence, Gregory E., Jr.
Lawrence, John V., Jr.
Lawrence, William P.
Leary, Ramon W.
Ledew, Thomas A.
Lee, Byron A.
Lehman, Donald A.
Leibowitz, Martin M.
Leis, Alfred C.
Lemon, Robert T.
Lentz, Charles M.
Leser, John R.
Lester, Louis R., Jr.
Leue, David E.
Lewis, Daniel A.
Lintner, Richard W.
- Lisanby, James W.
Little, James G.
Lockwood, Harold R.
Lofton, Edgar K., Jr.
Long, Charles R.
Loomis, Aubrey K.
Lorfano, Joseph J., Jr.
Loux, Raymond E.
Lovelace, Robert H.
Loyd, Rupert H.
Lund, John D.
Lynam, Donald M.
Lyne, George C.
Lytle, James H.
MacDowell, Charles R.
Mackell, Richard A.
MacKenzie, John D.
Mackey, Robert R.
Madera, Harry P.
Madison, Douglas W.
Mahon, Richard B.
Maier, Charles W., Jr.
Maire, Rex E.
Malloy, John E.
Mandeville, Robert C., Jr.
Mann, Earl
Manning, Richard T.
Mantz, Roy T.
Marcellus, Russell A.
Marlin, Hubert A.
Martin, Richard W.
Martin, William K.
Massa, Emiddio
Mathis, Paul J.
Matson, Willis A., II
Mauney, Thomas C.
Maxwell, Daryl O.
Mayo, William H.
Mazzolini, John A.
McAdams, John W., Jr.
McAnulty, David J.
McAnulty, Robert M., Jr.
McArthur, John C.
McCarthy, Richard L.
McAvenia, James F., Jr.
McClain, Kirby L., III
McClaran, Stephen W.
McClure, James R.
McDonald, Robert P.
McGarrah, William E., Jr.
McGlaughlin, Thomas H.
McJunkin, Russell E., Jr.
McKay, Robert B.
McKee, Samuel T.
McKellar, Edwin D., Jr.
McKnight, Jesse E., Jr.
McLemore, Albert S.
McLoughlin, James
McLoughlin, Howard T.
McNally, John H.
McNally, John J., Jr.
Mealy, Daniel N.
Meek, Donald B.
Merchant, Paul G.
Merrill, Warren H.
Messner, James R.
Michaud, Robert A.
Miguel, Theodore, Jr.
Miller, Raymond L.
Miller, Richard A.
Miller, William A.
Mills, Joseph E.
Minkinen, Erkki O.
Minnis, Marion L., Jr.
Mitchell, Joe C.
Moberly, Arthur L.
Moberly, Richard O., Jr.
Mooden, Donald O.
Mohr, Charles H.
Molzan, Edward W.
Montague, Lloyd L.
- Moore, Lundi A.
Moore, William F.
Morin, Gene D.
Morrison, Lewis E.
Morrisey, John N.
Muck, Floyd R.
Mull, Charles L., II
Mulligan, James A., Jr.
Murphy, Frank "M", Jr.
Myatt, Bert, Jr.
Myer, George W.
Neander, Stanley B.
Neiger, Ralph E.
Nelson, George G.
Nelson, Marvin D., Jr.
Nelson, Robert L.
Netro, Robert J.
Newark, Theodore E.
Newell, William C., Jr.
Newman, Fred S.
Newman, James F.
Noble, Thomas I.
Nordan, Emile E.
Norman, Frederick W., Jr.
Norton, Curtis R., Jr.
Notz, Robert C.
Nutt, Thomas O., Jr.
Oakes, Raymond H.
O'Brien, Charles J., Jr.
O'Brien, John W.
O'Connor, Francis E.
O'Donnell, George J., Jr.
O'Drain, John E.
Odobina, Stephen R.
Ohlrich, Walter E., Jr.
Olsen, Richard L., Jr.
O'Meara, Charles K.
O'Neill, Thomas F., Jr.
Orem, Charles A.
Ostrand, Allen E.
Otten, Henry E.
Overbey, Frank E., Jr.
Owens, Robert L.
Ozburn, Forrest C., Jr.
Page, Carroll S., Jr.
Palau, Henry S.
Palmer, Gary H.
Palmquist, John R.
Parce, James R.
Parker, Harry M., Jr.
Parode, Harlan D.
Parrish, William I.
Parthemer, Lloyd L.
Paschal, Joseph B., Jr.
Patterson, Jerry C.
Paulk, Joseph M.
Pausner, Joseph J., Jr.
Pelton, Robert L.
Pennington, Otis G.
Perry, Roger E., Jr.
Pester, Benjamin H.
Pester, Fred, Jr.
Peters, Ralph C., Jr.
Petersen, Donald E.
Pette, Donald C.
Pettigrew, Raymond A.
Pettit, Royce E., Jr.
Pezzel, Engelbert G.
Pfeiffer, King W.
Phillips, Charles T.
Phillips, Lawrence E.
Pickering, Richard C.
Pinzel, Lawrence E.
Platte, William A.
Platzek, Eugene H.
Portnoy, Howard R.
Pouliot, Jean R.
Powell, James R., Jr.
Prange, Eugene H.
Preston, Frank W.
Preston, Joseph M., Jr.
Price, Byron
Pride, Alfred M.
Profflet, Leo T.
- Puccini, Joseph E., Jr.
Pullar, Andrew, Jr.
Putnam, Charles L.
Quaid, Marvin M., Jr.
Quigley, Donovan B.
Quinn, Jack Q.
Radcliffe, Roderick T.
Rasmussen, James F., Jr.
Rau, William F.
Ray, Thomas B.
Redman, James R.
Redmond, John G.
Reed, Robert K.
Reed, Sherman C.
Regan, William B.
Reh, Donald E.
Reich, Charles J.
Replogle, Thomas H.
Resek, Lawrence H.
Reynolds, Kenneth C.
Richards, William L., Jr.
Risser, James B.
Rivard, Earl J.
Roberts, Robert "E"
Robertson, John W.
Robisch, Herbert E.
Rogers, Thomas S., Jr.
Root, John B., Jr.
Rosendahl, Edmund I.
Rosenquist, Donald E.
Ross, Thomas H.
Roth, Franklin H.
Rowe, John D.
Rowlands, David M.
Rube, Ervin B., Jr.
Rubin, Arnold J.
Rubins, Fredrick K.
Rudy, Byron C.
Rudy, Bryan C.
Rulis, Robert A.
Rumble, Maurice W.
Russell, George G.
Rutherford, Ralph B.
Rutledge, Howard E.
Ryan, John J., Jr.
Ryan, Philip J.
Sabalos, Nicholas
Sample, Richard J.
Sample, Robert J.
Sample, Wilbur H.
Sandsberry, Jack C.
Sargent, Herbert A.
Sarosdy, Louis R.
Sattler, Donald C.
Schaber, Rolph E.
Schaub, Robert L.
Schenker, Marvin L.
Schlank, John J., Jr.
Schneider, Arthur F.
Schoelen, Lawrence A.
Scholl, Kenneth C.
Schriefer, Walter A.
Schroeder, Robert A.
Schubert, Leslie H., Jr.
Schulte, Richard J.
Schultz, Jesse Z.
Schultz, Milton J., Jr.
Schwab, Robert W.
Schwarz, Ira N.
Scott, Melvin L.
Scribner, Henry I., Jr.
Scully, Donald G.
Sebenius, Carl H., Jr.
Selby, Donald E.
Self, William H. C.
Semeraro, Angelo P.
Shafer, Walter R.
Shannon, Rickard W.
Shartel, Howard A.
Shaughnessy, William D.
Sheridan, William R.
Sherman, Thomas H., Jr.
Shields, William B.
Shipman, Junious E.
Shultz, Robert T.
Simmons, Robert R.
- Skalla, Derald Z.
Skinner, Clifford A., Jr.
Skirm, George L., Jr.
Slankard, Max L.
Sleeper, Sherwin J.
Smith, Jerome W.
Smith, Maurice E.
Smith, Robert F., Jr.
Smith, Thomas M.
Smith, William D.
Smolinski, Joseph P., Jr.
Smyth, James M.
Snodgrass, Cornelius S., Jr.
Snyder, Carl S., Jr.
Snyder, John C.
Snyder, Roy D., Jr.
Solomon, Jerome E., Jr.
Sorg, George A.
Southall, Walter E., Jr.
Space, David J.
Sparks, Harold A., Jr.
Spayde, Keith C., Jr.
Speer, Paul H.
Spencer, John R.
Spencer, Robert W.
Spiller, John H., Jr.
Spowart, David J., Jr.
Springer, Roy M., Jr.
St. John, Alvin P.
Stack, Richard A.
Stalzer, Charles E.
Stapp, Aron L.
Steckbauer, Theodore C.
Steenfote, Eric H.
Stein, Earl M.
Stephan, Robert A.
Stewart, Thomas P.
St. Louis, Norman E.
Stollenwerck, William M.
Stone, Bruce G.
Storeide, Arthur J.
Storey, Joseph D.
Storm, John S.
Strand, John A., Jr.
Stratmann, Charles I.
Streich, Paul R.
Stull, Donald
Sudhoff, Herbert A.
Sullivan, Don M.
Summers, Gilbert L.
Sundt, Wilbur A.
Surovik, George A.
Sutherland, Donald G.
Swadener, John R.
Swanson, Carl W., Jr.
Switzer, James R.
Taylor, Francis C.
Taylor, Leslie A., Jr.
Tebo, Ballard W.
Tennison, Lonnie D.
Terrell, Fred W., Jr.
Thomas, Robert L.
Thomas, Walter R.
Thompson, James J.
Thompson, Robert C.
Thompson, William B., Jr.
Thorndike, Robert F.
Thorp, John H.
Thurston, Dick W.
Todd, Troy E.
Todd, Walter H., Jr.
Tollgaard, Elmer M.
Touch, Ralph J.
Townsend, "G" "E"
Toy, Frank E.
Traynor, Lawrence E.
Tregurtha, James D., Jr.
Trimble, Dan M.
- Trost, Carlisle A. H.
Trotter, Thomas K.
Tucker, Leonard L., Jr.
Tuomela, Clyde H.
Turnbull, James R.
Turner, Keith S.
Tvede, Ralph M., Jr.
Twite, Martin J., Jr.
Tyson, James J., Jr.
Underwood, Leland J.
Vaillancourt, Richard P.
Vankleeck, Justin L.
VanReeth, Eugene W.
Vaughn, Robert E.
Venable, Jack D.
Vestal, Edwin C., Jr.
Villanueva, Xavier V.
Vines, Thomas E.
Vogel, Oscar J., Jr.
Vollmer, Robert J.
Vosseler, Warren P.
Wagner, Eugene R.
Wagner, Robert H.
Wallace, David T.
Wallace, Donald E.
Wallace, Edwin S., Jr.
Wallace, Kenneth R.
Waller, Alexander E., Jr.
Warner, Brooks F.
Warwick, William B.
Wasniewski, Emil F.
Watson, Peter J.
Weatherly, Robert T.
Webb, William H.
Werner, Robert V.
Weymouth, Burton R.
Whaley, William S.
White, Grover C., Jr.
White, Wendell A.
Whitehead, Richard T.
Whitlock, Richard T.
Whitman, Donald L.
Whitmire, Vivien C.
Wigent, Richard A.
Wikeen, Donald B.
Wilber, Walter E.
Wilbur, Harley D.
Wildor, Fred W.
Wilgus, Carlton L.
Wilkins, James R., Jr.
Wille, James E.
Willi, Thomas A.
Williams, William A., III
Willingham, William E., Jr.
Willson, Donald M.
Wilson, Alexander B.
Wilson, Joseph W.
Wilson, William W.
Winfrey, Harvey M., Jr.
Winton, John R., Jr.
Wiram, Gordon H.
Wise, Gerald W.
Wiseman, Richard F.
Wisnabaker, Eugene M.
Wood, Lewis I.
Wooden, Neal R.
Woodruff, Richard F.
Woolcock, Thomas E.
Wooldridge, Edmund T., Jr.
Worcheseck, Robert R.
Worden, Dwight G.
Wright, William B.
Wuest, Carl I.
Wueth, Don L.
Wunderlich, Robert
Young, Casanave H., Jr.
Young, John W.
Youngblood, Norman L., Jr.
Zeisel, Richard S.
Zink, Stewart T.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Baggett, Arthur E., Jr.
Barsoum, Adib H.
Baxter, Donald L.
Brodine, Charles E.
Brown, Jacob V.
Brown, James M.
Burke, Erwin L.
Carson, William E.
Cole, Buell C.
Coulter, James A.
Davis, Richard G.
Dean, Harold N.
Dutton, Bythel D.
Easterday, Robert H.
Fitchett, Vernon H.
Gable, Walter D.
Gaines, Kenneth A.
Gebhardt, Hellmut C.
Getzen, Lindsay C.
Golden, Patrick E.
Good, Daniel C.
Gorsuch, George E.
Grisamore, Jennings M.
Gunning, Jeanjacques
Hartney, Thomas C.
Hayes, James W.
Hemness, Edwin M.
Herrmann, Louis A.
Hinds, Paul A.
Houk, Vernon N.
Jackson, Frederick E.
James, Arthur D.
Jensen, Joseph E., Jr.
Jones, Warren R.
Kane, John R.
Kaufmann, Edwin D.
Knox, Paul R.
Kroncke, George M.
Latham, Wilbur D.
LeBlanc, Gilbert A.
Lewis, Norman G.

COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Andrus, Harold R., Jr.
Armstrong, George K.
Baker, James J., Jr.
Ball, Thomas F., Jr.
Barber, Ray C.
Bauer, Robert F.
Baungard, Perry E.
Bayers, John A.
Bozewicz, John E.
Brown, Everett G.
Brown, Robert M.
Cloutier, Norman L.
Davis, James B.
DeVilbiss, Robert J.
Donley, Harold C., Jr.
Dughi, Carl M.
Dunham, Donald J., Jr.
Ely, William B., Jr.
Foster, Paul L.
Francis, Evans J.
Fussell, Theodore J.
Gove, Jack E.
Graham, Robert B.
Greenberg, Edwin G.
Halperin, George B.
Hamilton, William C., Jr.
Hammond, James E.
Henderson, John M.
Hudson, Richard S.
Hutchinson, Arthur E.
James, Billy M.
Johnson, Ernie F.
Jones, Durton H.
Killebrew, Thomas E.

COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Berger, John W.
Bergeur, John P. X.
Canfield, Robert A.
Clayton, Walter B.
Condit, John C.
Conte, James W.
Crawford, Jack V.
Croston, Calvin J.
Dillard, Donald H.

Hammond, Edward P.
Hardage, Owen A., Jr.
Heaney, Harold V.
Heath, Robert H.
Hershberger, John R.
Hill, Rodger F.
Hitchens, Walter C.
Holland, Harry W., Jr.
Hollis, William F., Jr.
Howard, William R.
Howland, Barker C.
Huffman, William W. C.
Ingebreton, Ervin D.
Insko, Myron C.
Jenkins, Charles L.
Jones, Asa W.
Karras, Nick S.
Keen, Homer E., Jr.
Kicklighter, Edward H.
Lang, Robert F.
Lemaster, Donald C.
McDonald, Leo J.
Mole, Robert L.
Moore, Withers M.
Moye, Thomas E.
Nelson, Everett B.
Nerthling, Edwin J.
O'Brien, Robert P.
Otto, Albert J.
Perry, Johnie L.
Rittenhouse, James
Ryan, Joseph E.
Samuel, William R.
Stewart, Del F., Jr.
Stroman, Henry W.
Szczeny, Charles A.
Veltman, Dean K.
Winterhoff, Norman E.
Zeller, Kenneth P.

COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Anderson, Richard E.
Bourne, William A.
Butler, Charles W.
Foley, Richard L.
Forehand, Paul W.
Hoffman, James I.
Jones, Robert L.
Kimmick, Varne M.

COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Abbott, Paul L.
Ainle, James E., Jr.
Anderson, John "T"
Armstrong, William P.
Bohacek, Joseph R.
Bowers, Gerald M.
Bradley, Kenton T.
Chutter, Reinald J.
Clarke, Homer
Cowen, Charles E., Jr.
Deaton, Herbert C.
Elliott, James R.
Enoch, James D.
Evans, Charles G.
Falcone, Philip R.
Fields, Robert E.
Flagg, Roger H.
Foster, Richard D.
Freeburn, Harold E., Jr.
Garman, Thomas A.
Gorman, Walter J.
Grandich, Russell A.
Granger, Ronald G.
Hardin, Jefferson F.
Hays, James W.
Hegley, John H.
Hembre, Lloyd E.
Hiatt, William R.
Hodson, Harold W.
Hoffus, Edwin L.
Holmes, John B.
Hyde, Jack E.
Hylton, Roscoe P., Jr.
Johnson, Dean L.
Kelley, John P.
Kelley, William P.
Klein, Edward P.
Little, Earl E., Jr.
Luther, Norman K.
McKean, Thomas W.
McKinnon, John A., Jr.
Moore, Frank B.
Nolf, Robert S.
Orrahood, Robert H.
Pebbley, Harry C.
Perand, Steven W.
Phillips, James W.
Pinkley, Virgil A.
Pistocco, Louis R.
Prange, William H.
Reid, Albert F.
Ruliffson, Franklin R.
Sazima, Henry J.
Shirley, Robert E.
Shreve, William B., Jr.
Slagle, Lowell E.
Smith, Albert R.
Stanley, James H.
Sydow, Paul J.
Taylor, "B" Frank
Tencia, Joseph I.
Terry, Bill C.
Thomason, Robert R.
Thompson, Robert G.
Tow, Herman D., Jr.
Westcott, Maurice E.
Whately, Thomas L.
Wilson, James M.
Wooden, Robert A.
Woodland, Everan C., Jr.
Woody, Wilton G.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Barkley, Lucien E.
Beam, Walter E., Jr.
Bergquist, Melvin D.
Berry, Newell H.
Boggs, Clifford W.
Charles, John P.
Courtney, John C.
Dempewolf, Eugene H.
Dewitt, Richard G.
Douglas, George P.
Duffey, William S.
Flaherty, Edward M.
Freeman, Noel L.
Gay, Laverne W.
Gehring, Jack H.
Gellman, Martin
Goodrich, Neil E., Jr.
Huber, Godfrey S.
Jones, William H.
Kaufman, Louis R.
Keating, Katherine
Lacy, Dexter J.
Laedtkke, Ralph H.
Lee, Raymond W.
Levich, Calman
Marsh, William G., Jr.
McGuire, Francis E.
McIlraith, James D.
McMahon, Talmadge G.
McMichael, Allen E.
Miller, Edwin B.
Pruitt, John D.
Reed, Robert F.
Sanders, James M.
Schlamm, Norbert A.
Schwab, Albert J.
Stiles, Thomas R.
Still, Donald E.
Sykes, Stanley E.
Testa, Michele J.

Tober, Theodore W.
Wheeler, Thomas E.

COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Conder, Maxine
Dalmaso, Amelia M.
Davis, Alice L.
Eberhardt, Marie
Gagnon, Eva M.
Gardill, Norma H.
Hogan, Hazel L.
Miller, Jean L.
Parent, Shirley M.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Abbott, Leonard J.
Adams, Billy J.
Adams, John L.
Aden, Melvin O.
Ager, Snowden C.
Agnew, William F.
Ailes, John W., IV
Ake, Charles P.
Alberts, Richard P.
Albritton, Charles R.
Anderson, Donald M., Jr.
Alecxi, Donald A.
Alexander, Howard W.
Alexander, James W.
Allen, Galen B.
Allen, John C.
Allgood, Bruce T., Jr.
Ammann, Robert E.
Anderson, Erns M.
Anderson, George R.
Anderson, Robert G.
Anthony, Charles B.
Arcele, Mark, Jr.
Arthur, Glenn N., Jr.
Aschenbeck, Gene W.
Asher, Roy W.
Ashford, James P.
Asman, Robert K.
Astley, James F.
Atherton, Raymond
Aven, Donald J.
Awbrey, Roy D.
Bader, Allen L.
Baglioni, Victor A.
Bailey, Gail R.
Baird, Winfield S., Jr.
Baker, David E.
Baker, Richard L.
Baker, Walter F.
Baldry, George K.
Baldwin, John A., Jr.
Baleme, Leroy C.
Ballinger, Robert M.
Balsamo, Leo J.
Banbury, Floyd R.
Bannon, John M.
Barber, James A., Jr.
Barker, George D.
Barker, William S.
Barnes, Richard A.
Barr, Ronald L.
Barr, Walter A.
Bastin, Carl A.
Batdorf, Paul D.
Bates, Glenn D.
Bates, Walter F.
Batzler, John R.
Bauder, James R.
Baumgartner, John P.
Bausch, Francis A.
Bean, Alan L.
Beardslee, Ralph C., Jr.
Beardsley, Jerry L.
Bechelmayer, Leroy R.
Beeby, Francis J.
Beisel, Gerald W.
Belay, William J.
Benefiel, Oscar W., Jr.
Bennett, Joseph E.
Bennett, Raymond "D"
Benton, Joseph D.
Bethany, Jesse E.
Biegel, Herbert K.
Bigney, Russell E.
Bliderback, John E.
Birdsall, David M.
Bishop, Michael E.
Black, Cole
Black, George E.
Blackmar, Fredrik S.
Blackwell, Jack L., Jr.
Blaine, Robert D.
Blair, Peter S.
Blanchard, James W., Jr.
Blandford, James R.
Blenkhorn, James M., Jr.
Blount, Donald W.
Blythe, Russell M.
Bock, "E" James
Bodensteiner, Wayne D.
Boland, Bruce R.
Bolerjack, Robert C.
Bolt, Roland L.
Bond, John R.
Borden, Douglas H., Jr.
Boslaugh, David L.
Bossart, Edmund B., Jr.
Boucher, Francis T.
Boudreaux, Byron F.
Bowler, Peter P.
Boyd, Robert L.
Brace, Robert L.
Bracken, Leonard A., Jr.
Bradley, Bedford C.
Brady, Frederick L., Jr.
Brady, Joseph G.
Brandau, James F.
Braun, Carl T.
Braun, Peter J.
Brickson, Herbert O.
Briggs, Donald R.
Browder, Edward H.
Brown, Harold E.
Brown, Isom L.
Brown, Leo P.
Brown, Thomas F., III
Browning, Robert B.
Brubaker, Joseph D., Jr.
Buc, Robert L.
Buchanan, Auda E.
Buck, Harry J.
Buck, Wallace A.
Buckley, John E.
Bull, Norman S.
Bullard, Jerry L.
Burch, William J.
Burden, Harvey W.
Burgess, Harold E., Jr.
Burke, Robert M.
Burke, Thomas J., Jr.
Burns, John A.
Burrows, Hubbard F., Jr.
Bush, William L., Jr.
Butterfield, Frederick D.
Buzzard, Robert D.
Byrne, Joseph L.
Cabanillas, Jose C., II
Cajka, Anthony C.
Calhoun, William B., III
Cameron, Jim F.
Camp, John R.

Zaller, Frank A.

- Campbell, Gerald D. Deibert, Bernard N.
Campbell, Harry F., Jr. DeLano, George B.
Campbell, Michael J. Del Giudice, David
Campbell, Richard H. Delozier, James L.
Cann, Thomas P. Demmin, Lester F.
Caraba, John H. Dennison, Daniel C.
Carlson, Dudley L. Denton, Terry J.
Carlson, Leland J. Desher, William A.
Carr, James M., Jr. Devalois, Edwin W.
Carry, Allan H. DeVito, Vincent H.
Carson, Burton E., II DiBona, Charles J.
Carter, Powell F., Jr. Dicarlo, Vincent A.
Caruso, Amedeo B. Dickson, George K.
Carver, Robert L. Diehm, William C., III
Caston, Terry G. Dietz, Warren C.
Caswell, David W. Dillon, John F.
Cazares, Ralph B. Dingle, James W., Jr.
Chaney, Conner F. Dixon, Max W.
Channel, Ralph N. Doheny, Vincent
Chapman, William R. Donnelly, Verne G.
Chase, Warren P. Donovan, Ian E. M.
Chiz, Thaddeus F. Doonan, Robert J.
Christensen, Howard E. Dopazo, Anthony J.
Christian, Robert R. Dougherty, Gerald P.
Christmas, Walter B. Dougherty, James M.
Cicolani, Angelo G. Downing, Thomas P.
Cisson, Arthur Doyle, Robert C.
Clark, Robert E. Duffy, Francis J.
Clark, Robert "C" Dunn, Joseph J.
Clausen, Carroll E. Dunne, Francis R.
Clement, Carl C., Jr. Dupree, Richard E.
Cleveland, Gary M. Durbin, Robert H., Jr.
Cliff, Gene L. Durgin, David A.
Clinton, Samuel T. Easton, Ervin R.
Coakley, Stephen A. Eaves, James S.
Cobb, Emsley F. Eckels, Donald E.
Cobb, George W. Edberg, Walter O.
Cockfield, David W. Edson, Charles T.
Coffey, Roger L. Eldsmoe, Norman E.
Coleman, Charles L. Elam, David L.
Coleman, Theodore Elder, William N.
L., Jr. Elliott, Charles P.
Colley, Richard T. Elliott, Fredrick H.
Collier, Neuland C. Emery, Robert E.
Colmie, Joseph V. Emery, Thomas R. M.
Colvin, William P. Emmett, Joseph R.
Combs, Lawrence L. Englert, Robert J.
Comstock, Richard I. Erickson, Kenneth J.
Conley, David J. Ervin, Billy M.
Conway, James M. Estocin, Michael J.
Cook, Charles F. Etcheson, Gerald R.
Cooper, James A. Evans, Irvin R.
Copeman, Thomas H., Jr. Evans, James J.
Corcoran, Martin F. Evans, Richard P.
Cornett, Paul A. Evans, Thomas G.
Cotton, Alfred S. Everett, Lauren R.
Coupe, Richard H. Evrard, Leroy
Courtney, Warren P., Jr. Exom, Roger M.
Coward, Alton A., Jr. Fairchild, Joseph D.
Cowles, Robert R. Fall, Robert H., III
Cralg, Lee R. Fancher, Allen P.
Crawford, Robert E. Farino, Francis J.
Creech, Worley Y., Jr. Farris, David E.
Creighton, Perry F., Jr. Fassett, Harold S., Jr.
Crider, James A. Feakes, George E., Jr.
Crozier, Robert A. Fegan, Joseph H.
Crummer, James F. Fend, Clarence E., Jr.
Cummings, Joseph D. Ferguson, Sam A.
Currie, Raymond M. Ferrier, Harry H.
Curtis, John G., Jr. Fetterman, John H., Jr.
Cutchen, Paul O. Fillingane, Hulon P.
Daleke, Richard A. Finch, Albert
D'Aloia, John, Jr. Fink, Jerome I.
Daly, Paul S. Finke, Walter J., Jr.
Dartnell, William H. Fischer, Herman V., Jr.
Daus, Rudolph H. Fisher, John C.
Davis, George W., Jr. Fisk, Harold W.
Davis, Harry L. Fitzgerald, John
Davis, Richard C. Dix, Vernon H.
Davis, Richard H. Fladager, Myles E.
Dawson, Albert L. Flanagan, John E., Jr.
Deal, James W. Fleming, James T., Jr.
Dean, Ronald I. Fleury, Clement E.
Debroder, Glen G. Flick, John P.
DeGross, James L. Flight, John W., Jr.
Floyd, Donald E.
Foard, Wyatt F., Jr.
Foley, Harvey D.
Folta, Daniel A.
- Fonda, Raymond C.
Foote, Theodore P.
Ford, James N.
Ford, Wilbur S.
Fountain, Robert R., Jr.
Fox, Everts C., Jr.
Francis, Nigel D.
Francke, Robert L.
Frecker, David A.
Frederick, Peter G.
French, Maynard D.
Froid, James C.
Fryksdale, Frans H.
Fueston, Vernon M., Jr.
Fulford, John A.
Fulk, Gerald A.
Fuller, Milo W.
Fullerton, Richard F.
Fulton, Elbert M., Jr.
Funk, James R.
Furlong, George M., Jr.
Gaffrey, Leo J.
Galinsky, Jerome J.
Gallagher, John W.
Gallagher, Patrick J.
Galloway, Edward D.
Gammell, Clark M.
Gardner, Geoffrey L.
Garrow, Jack A.
Gasser, Thomas A.
Gauthey, Jules R.
Geer, Richard G.
Gehring, Gary J.
Gerhan, Charles F., Jr.
Gerl, Neil D.
Gerrity, William J.
Giedzinski, Henry B.
Gilchrist, Richard B.
Gildea, John F.
Gilliamsen, Donald A.
Gilmore, Joseph M.
Gilmore, Kenneth D.
Glade, Gerald L.
Gleim, James M.
Goetz, Robert B.
Golanka, Stanley R.
Gonzalez, Alfred H.
Gooden, Milford I.
Gooding, Charles L., Jr.
Gore, James R.
Gottfried, Howard L.
Grady, Michael T.
Graf, Howard F.
Graftus, Guy A. B.
Graham, Joel H.
Graham, Roger L.
Grant, Edwin H., Jr.
Grantman, Roger H.
Granum, Roger B.
Graue, Clifford R.
Greathouse, Edwin A.
Greene, George W., Jr.
Greene, James F., Jr.
Greenhalgh, William T., Jr.
Grego, James M.
Gregory, Nelson B.
Grider, Billy F.
Griffin, James L.
Griffing, Edward P.
Grimes, Laurence H., Jr.
Grothe, Henry J.
Grozen, Paul B.
Grundty, Charles D.
Grunenwald, John W.
Guerra, Albert H.
Guldry, Rodney R.
Guilday, Daniel S.
Guille, Sherred L.
Guilmont, Gordon R.
Gunther, Howard P.
Hagee, Charles "R"
Hagen, Elmer C.
Hager, Donald G.
Hague, John D.
Haines, Collins H.
- Halle, "S" Portland, III
Hamilton, David G.
Hamilton, Harry D.
Hamilton, Robert B.
Hammond, Leroy L.
Haney, Norman L.
Hanson, John I.
Hanson, Robert P.
Harden, Thad H.
Harlow, Bruce A.
Harmon, James O.
Harmony, Lee D., Jr.
Harper, Elwood N.
Harter, John V.
Hartsaw, David R.
Harvey, Donald L.
Harvey, Neil L.
Harvey, Richard M.
Hastoglis, Anthony A.
Hayes, Fay C.
Hazle, Hugh A.
Heckman, Donald C.
Hellinger, Richard L.
Hendricks, Richard A.
Hendricks, George H.
Hendrickson, Claude F., Jr.
Henry, Albert L., Jr.
Henry, Jack A.
Henry, William F.
Hepworth, Robert W.
Herberger, Albert J.
Hernandez, Diego E.
Herndon, Franklin C., Jr.
Herzog, Louis L.
Hettinger, Louis P.
Heyl, William E.
Hickey, John A.
Higgins, Leo A.
Highall, Kenneth L.
Hine, Paul M., Jr.
Hine, Raymond W.
Hine, William G.
Hinger, Carl K.
Hinton, Robert M.
Hoehne, Ralph L.
Hogan, George C.
Hogg, Robert L.
Holderness, Robert T., Jr.
Holland, William J., Jr.
Hollinshead, William G.
Holloway, Lowell J.
Holman, Robert A., Jr.
Hoover, Harry A.
Horne, Hainyard L., Jr.
Hoseplan, Edward S.
Hosler, Charles S.
Hoskins, Perry D.
Houston, Chester E.
Howatt, Gerald J.
Howells, David A.
Hubbard, Henry L.
Huggins, Harry L.
Hughes, Richard M.
Hughlett, David E.
Hunley, Charles C.
Hunt, Herman L.
Hunt, James H.
Hunt, Richard L.
Hurst, Lee R.
Ives, Clarence D.
Ives, Richard H.
Jackson, George L.
Jackson, Robert S.
James, Harry R., III
Janes, William E., Jr.
Janus, Anthony, Jr.
Jardine, Edward F., Jr.
Jaudon, Johns P.
Jeffers, Lawrence R.
Jenkins, James R., Jr.
Jenkins, John C.
Jenkins, John S.
Jensen, Carl T.
Johnson, Billie D.
Johnson, George L.
Johnson, Grant R.
- Johnson, John R.
Johnson, Lauren A.
Johnson, Raymond F., Jr.
Johnson, Roger D.
Johnson, Thomas J.
Johnson, Virgil J.
Johnson, William J., Jr.
Johnson, William T.
Johnston, Fred W., Jr.
Jones, Gerald L.
Jones, Harry W.
Jones, John L.
Jones, Roycroft C., Jr.
Jordan, Arliss L.
Jordan, Douglas S.
Judd, Robert G.
Jumper, Eugene A., Jr.
Jurgensen, Kenneth I.
Kaag, William C.
Kaiser, Donald S.
Karlen, James H.
Katzman, Marvin S.
Keaney, Mark J.
Keene, Thomas J.
Keener, Delbert V.
Keery, Jerry L.
Keil, Louis D.
Kelser, Robert B.
Keith, Clyde R.
Keller, Constantine C., III
Kellerman, Donald W.
Kelly, Donald C.
Kelly, Francis D.
Kendra, Robert J.
Kennedy, Calvin E.
Kennedy, Jack M.
Kennington, William A.
Kerrigan, Robert J.
Keys, Robert C.
Kiefaber, Thomas G.
Kiehl, Richard L.
Kilborn, Edgar L.
Kingston, Edward A.
Kingston, John J., Jr.
Kirby, Alexander G., Jr.
Klugman, Dale R.
Klusmann, Charles F.
Knapp, Franklin P.
Knepper, Robert R., Jr.
Knoth, Larence W., Sr.
Kobler, Robert H.
Koch, Richard J., Jr.
Koehler, Robert L.
Koester, Earl C., II
Koester, Frederick H., Jr.
Kohloff, Donald A.
Kohn, Edwin R., Jr.
Kois, John R.
Kolaras, Demosthenes N.
Kopfman, Theodore F.
Kother, Charles G.
Krag, George H.
Kraus, Kenneth E.
Krienke, Henry P.
Kronzer, Joseph J., Jr.
Krueger, Richard H.
Kucera, Ronald C.
Kugler, Valarius E.
Kuligowski, Theodore J.
Kupilinski, Stanley J.
Lachut, Herbert M.
Lake, Rodney D.
Lam, Chapman L.
Lambert, Russell G.
Lamers, John P.
Langston, Thomas J.
Lapp, Charles B.
Larson, John P.
Laughlin, Alvin T.
Lavallee, William F.
Lawhorn, Eugene M.
Lawniczak, George E., Jr.
Laye, John E.
Layn, Samuel W.
- Leaver, John M., Jr.
Lee, Leonard M.
Lee, Melvin R.
Lenardi, Donald M.
Leo, Leonard
Leopold, Robert K.
Lett, Raymond E.
Levey, Gerald
Lewis, John R., Jr.
Lewis, Joseph C.
Lighton, Paul G.
Ligon, Richard R.
Lillenthal, Donald H.
Lindsey, Austin M.
Linehan, Donald B.
Lipford, William L.
Liptak, Richard D.
Locke, William J.
Lockhart, John V.
Lohrey, Thomas E., Jr.
Long, John F.
Looby, Robert J.
Loomis, Robert R.
Lotton, Donald E.
Lotze, Herbert E., Jr.
Love, John J.
Low, Joseph L.
Lowery, Willis E.
Luitjens, Robert H.
Lukenbach, Max D.
Lukomski, Fred J.
Lull, Edward W.
Lund, Eugene P.
Lundy, Robert H.
Lusk, Charles T.
Lynch, Hugh F.
Lynch, Will T.
Lyons, William P.
Mack, John A.
MacKenzie, Joseph D.
MacKinnon, Malcolm, III
MacLean, Robert E.
Magee, Donald C.
Manheimer, Donald Z.
Mann, John A.
Manthorpe, William H. J., Jr.
Maratea, Ronald "M"
Marcoux, Louis H.
Markel, Douglas S.
Marquis, Ronald A.
Marsh, Lloyd P.
Martin, Donald
Martin, Donald L.
Martin, George W.
Martineau, Roger J.
Masalin, Charles E.
Masterson, Leo S.
Mathews, Donald R.
Mathews, Richard L.
Mathews, Mitchell D., Jr.
Matzner, Rudolph, Jr.
Mauer, Tommy L.
Mauldin, James H.
McArdle, Stephen J., Jr.
McCarthy, Philip R., Jr.
McCauley, William F.
McClellan, Billy L.
McClellan, Gordon
McCoy, Frank R., Jr.
McCrimmon, Douglas R.
McDonnell, John R.
McGonagill, Eber C.
McGonegal, Donal E.
McGrath, James W.
McGuinness, Donald A.
McHale, Edward B.
McIsaac, Alban T.
McKay, Richard D.
McKeown, Thomas J., Jr.
McKinlay, Archibald, Jr.
McKinzie, Raymond C.
McKnight, Kent A.
McLaren, Alfred S.

- McLyman, Edward J., Jr.
 McNish, John E.
 McVoy, Robert P.
 Meek, Roger S.
 Meglio, Robert F.
 Meloy, Robert T.
 Melton, Wade I.
 Meltzer, Herbert S.
 Mengle, Kenneth J.
 Merritt, Robert S.
 Meyer, William F.
 Mieldazis, Richard J.
 Miesse, Walter T.
 Miles, William H.
 Miller, Justin A., Jr.
 Miller, Robert N.
 Miller, Robert W.
 Miller, Ronald C.
 Miller, Ronald D.
 Miller, Russell C.
 Miller, Theodore W.
 Miller, William H.
 Milligan, Jack R.
 Minnich, Donald E.
 Miyagawa, George R.
 Moats, Lewis D.
 Monaghan, James J.
 Moody, DeWitt H.
 Moore, Gene R.
 Morano, Anthony
 Morgan, John R.
 Moriarty, Jack O.
 Morris, James I.
 Morrison, Robert M.
 Morrow, Richard D.
 Moss, David L.
 Moxley, Donald F.
 Mudgett, Richard L.
 Multer, Richard P.
 Munger, Burton L.
 Munsey, Malcom H.
 Murton, David B.
 Mustin, Henry C.
 Myers, Robert U.
 Narmi, Ronald E.
 Nash, Gordon C., Jr.
 Nash, Owen W.
 Nelson, Roger E., Jr.
 Newbegin, Robert G., Jr.
 Newell, Byron B., Jr.
 Nixon, Robert T.
 Norris, Frederick J., Jr.
 North, Henry C., Jr.
 Nyquist, John W.
 Oakes, Winslow B.
 O'Brien, Charles M., Jr.
 O'Connell, Daniel E.
 O'Connell, Richard M.
 O'Dell, Jerry T.
 O'Donnell, John L.
 Oehlbeck, Edward W.
 Ogden, Edward G.
 Olsen, Walter E.
 Olson, Ross S.
 Ormond, George, Jr.
 Osborn, Harold N.
 Osborn, Lloyd C.
 Osher, Victor E., Jr.
 Oslun, William J.
 Ostergren, James E.
 O'Sullivan, Richard C.
 Overbay, William A.
 Overdorff, William R.
 Overman, William J., Jr.
 Owen, James V., Jr.
 Padra, Jerry C.
 Paganelli, John E.
 Paisley, John B., III
 Palmer, Philip M.
 Parker, Elton C., Jr.
 Paschall, Allan P.
 Paul, Roy C.
 Payne, Thomas G.
 Pearl, Harlan R.
 Pearl, Robert E.
 Peckham, Daniel E.
 Pedigo, Robert E.
 Peebles, Edward M.
- Peirce, William B.
 Perez, Joseph F.
 Perry, Raymond
 Perry, Ronald W.
 Pesenti, Francis V.
 Peters, Richard A.
 Peterson, Fred C.
 Peterson, Richard A.
 Petri, Gordon L.
 Pfeiffer, Paul N.
 Phillips, George S.
 Phillips, James C.
 Phillips, Paul E.
 Pielstick, Blake H.
 Pierce, John T.
 Pietrowski, Joseph L.
 Pilcher, Howard G.
 Pillow, George E., Jr.
 Pirie, Robert B., Jr.
 Pitts, David B.
 Plesur, Jack J.
 Plowman, Herschel L.
 Plumly, Charles M.
 Poe, Benjamin L., Jr.
 Pollmann, Eugene L.
 Poppa, Lawrence G.
 Potter, Thomas B., Jr.
 Powell, John H.
 Powers, Edward F., Jr.
 Powers, John B.
 Prather, Walter F.
 Pray, William L.
 Prentice, Gordon R.
 Pressly, George B.
 Prosser, Rudolph J.
 Pugliese, William N.
 Pullen, Luther D.
 Rademacher, John W.
 Radler, David H.
 Raiter, Richard F.
 Ratliff, William E.
 Rausch, Leonard M.
 Raysin, Paul E.
 Reed, Calvin C.
 Reed, Richard L.
 Rees, Malcolm C., Jr.
 Reid, Gerald E.
 Reise, Thomas L.
 Reitzel, Philip M.
 Renard, John W.
 Renninger, Willard H.
 Rentz, William O.
 Reszetar, Stephen W.
 Reynolds, David B.
 Reynolds, Keith A.
 Reynolds, Marvin D.
 Reynolds, Preston A.
 Rhodes, William K., Jr.
 Rice, Robert V.
 Richey, Frederick J.
 Ricketts, Myron V.
 Riddell, Alvin R.
 Ries, Ronald E.
 Riley, Thomas R., Jr.
 Riviere, James P.
 Robbins, Paul H.
 Roberge, Francis D.
 Roberts, John W.
 Roberts, Wilson J.
 Rockwell, William A.
 Roe, John E., Jr.
 Rollins, Everett F., Jr.
 Roth, James A.
 Roth, James F.
 Rouchon, Alvin A.
 Ruesch, James M.
 Rule, Robert R.
 Ruotolo, Anthony P.
 Rush, William H.
 Russell, Melbert E.
 Ryan, James W.
 Salmon, Robert L.
 Sample, Chester G.
 Samuelson, Charles R.
 Sanders, Carl H., Jr.
 Sangster, Robert A.
 Santivaschi, John D.
 Saunders, Wesley W.
 Sawyer, Allan R.
 Schlemmer, Robert M.
 Schmidt, Edward A.
- Schrader, Harry C., Jr.
 Schultz, Earl E.
 Schultz, Thomas D.
 Schuppert, Vincent J.
 Schwaebe, Charles F.
 Schwartz, Robert J.
 Schwendeman, George C.
 Scoles, Albert J.
 Scott, Augustus E., Jr.
 Scott, Austin B., Jr.
 Scott, Gary L.
 Scott, George W.
 Scott, MacGregor G.
 Scott, Ronald D.
 Searlight, Murland W.
 Seely, James M. G.
 Segal, Robert "B"
 Selbert, Markley R.
 Selgrath, James J.
 Serig, Ward E. K.
 Shanahan, Thomas E.
 Shaughnessy, Francis M.
 Shearin, John W.
 Sheldon, Charles "B"
 Shelton, Donald C.
 Shepard, Rolf A.
 Shields, Dan G.
 Shine, Thomas, Jr.
 Shulick, John, Jr.
 Shultz, Donald E., Jr.
 Shumaker, Robert H.
 Sievert, Robert G.
 Siljestrom, Gordon F.
 Sill, John R.
 Simia, Richard
 Simmering, Larry K.
 Simon, Roger O.
 Sineath, George E.
 Skorupski, Stanley S., Jr.
 Slack, Stephen R.
 Slayton, Marshall T.
 Slough, John H.
 Smith, Barton L.
 Smith, Charles L.
 Smith, Charles R.
 Smith, Charles R.
 Smith, Cyril P.
 Smith, Darrel
 Smith, Dickinson M.
 Smith, Donald A.
 Smith, Edward G.
 Smith, John W.
 Smith, Marvin G., Jr.
 Smith, Richard J. W.
 Smith, Richard H.
 Smith, Robert L.
 Smith, William D.
 Smith, William C., Jr.
 Snyder, Sherman R.
 Sousa, Manuel B., Jr.
 Southall, Charles M.
 Southard, David F.
 Spisak, Thomas J.
 Spry, Norman L.
 Stacy, Robert E.
 Stanford, Stanley A.
 Steenstra, George A.
 Stehle, Leroy R.
 Stembel, David M., Jr.
 Stephens, Gordon L.
 Stetz, Elias J.
 Stevens, James R.
 Stevens, William
 Stevenson, Peter K.
 Stewart, John E.
 Stickling, William R.
 Stickney, Harold "L"
 Stoddart, Ronald L.
 Stone, Robert A.
 Stone, Ronald P.
 Stoneback, Charles K.
 Stott, George W., Jr.
 Strange, Robert C.
 Stratton, Richard A.
 Streit, John B.
 Striffler, Willard C., Jr.
 Stuart, Donald B.
 Stuebben, Richard W., Jr.
- Stuntz, Harley L., III
 Sullivan, Dennis J., Jr.
 Sullivan, Florence M.
 Sullivan, Richard M., Jr.
 Sullivan, Thomas E.
 Sutherland, Paul E., Jr.
 Switzer, Anton R.
 Switzer, Robert J.
 Sympson, William G. A., Jr.
 Sznyter, Edward W., Jr.
 Tallman, John M.
 Tansey, Eugene A.
 Tarver, Charles A., Jr.
 Taylor, John E.
 Taylor, Patterson, C.
 Tennon, Raymond P.
 Test, Richard "Z"
 Thayer, Albert J.
 Thomas, Spencer J.
 Thompson, Emil S., Jr.
 Thompson, James C.
 Thompson, Raymond L.
 Thune, John R.
 Tice, George D., Jr.
 Tindall, Frederick W.
 Todaro, Donald G.
 Todd, James F.
 Toncray, James R.
 Toney, Albert L., Jr.
 Toupin, Ernest J., Jr.
 Toutant, Donald J.
 Tracy, George W., II
 Tracy, William K.
 Trimble, Delmer
 Truman, Ernest W., Jr.
 Trysland, Arnold L.
 Tsantes, George, Jr.
 Tucker, James W.
 Tully, William R., Jr.
 Turley, John W.
 Turner, Edmund L.
 Turner, Lee R., Jr.
 Turpel, Joseph F.
 Tuttle, Jerry O.
 Underwood, Fred S.
 Vandewater, George L., Jr.
 Van Dien, Casper R.
 Van Kleek, Loring E.
 Varhalla, Michael R.
 Vaught, Gerald C.
 Veatch, Philip A.
 Vehorn, Raymond C.
 Vernam, Claude C.
 Vilhauer, Levern T.
 Villar, Emmanuel J.
 VonPerbandt, Louis K.
 Wack, Charles G.
 Wade, Seaborn H., Jr.
 Waggoner, Donald L.
 Walden, William A.
 Waldrop, Clyde E.
 Walker, Benny R.
 Walker, Eugene R.
 Walker, John A., Jr.
 Walker, William E.
 Wallin, Homer N., Jr.
 Walsh, John J.
 Walsh, Lawrence P.
 Walsh, William A.
 Walter, Joseph J.
 Warburton, Thomas G.
 Ward, Charles W. D., Jr.
 Ward, Conrad J.
 Ward, John H.
 Warrick, Richard P.
 Warthen, Ronald R.
 Watson, George, Jr.
 Watson, Jerome F.
 Watson, John
 Watson, Thomas P.
 Ways, Raymond A.
 Weaver, John C.
 Webb, John B.
 Weber, Richard M.
 Webster, Hugh L.
- Weed, John W.
 Weigand, David K.
 Wernimont, Donald J.
 West, Donald A.
 Westbrook, Donald H.
 Westbrook, Darrel E., Jr.
 Wetzel, James F.
 White, Bernard A.
 White, Billy J.
 White, Danforth E.
 White, Jack M.
 White, Marvin L.
 White, Raymond L.
 White, Robert C.
 White, Trentwell M., Jr.
 Wickstrand, Don R.
 Wierck, Kenneth D.
 Wigley, Lawrence S.
 Wigley, William W.
 Wilkinson, Edward A., Jr.
 Willett, John A., IV
 Willett, Richard S.
 Williams, David E.
 Williams, Gerald G.
 Williams, Gordon R., Jr.
 Williams, John O., Jr.
 Williamson, John P., Jr.
 Willis, James L., Jr.
 Willyard, Robert H.
 Wilson, Derek W.
- Wilson, Gordon B.
 Wilson, John R., Jr.
 Wilson, Wayne N.
 Wilson, William R.
 Wilster, Gunnar F.
 Winchester, Warren H.
 Winiker, David R.
 Winn, John C., Jr.
 Winn, Velmer A. J.
 Wise, Stephen A.
 Witherspoon, Beverly W.
 Witthoft, Ronald D.
 Wittner, Carroll H. J.
 Wolfe, Glenn C.
 Wolkenstorfer, Daniel J.
 Wood, Albert A., Jr.
 Wood, David E.
 Wood, John D., Jr.
 Woodcock, Henry P., Jr.
 Woolnough, Robert M.
 Wright, Robert R.
 Yaeger, Ernest F.
 Yonke, William D.
 York, Howard L.
 Young, Leonard R.
 Young, Milton E.
 Yurso, Joseph F.
 Zaborniak, Walter J.
 Zadd, Charles J.
 Zipf, Otto A.
 Zselezsky, Emil J.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

- Akers, Richard E.
 Akin, Richard W.
 Amsler, Fred R., Jr.
 Anastasi, Gaspar W.
 Armstrong, Robert B.
 Austin, Raymond F., Jr.
 Bellinger, Sidney B., Jr.
 Black, Paul L.
 Boone, Jephtha T.
 Brodhead, Charles L., Jr.
 Brough, James W.
 Cavender, William F.
 Cefalo, Robert C.
 Chapman, Marvin J.
 Chenault, Oran W., Jr.
 Choquette, Armand J., Jr.
 Coleman, James D.
 Copman, Louis
 Curry, Norville
 Davis, David B., II
 Davis, Gerald L.
 Davis, Reginald M.
 Delisser, Robert B. M.
 Dickson, Larry G.
 Dodgen, John C.
 Dully, Frank E., Jr.
 Dunne, Michael J.
 Eddington, William R.
 Engelke, Harold A., Jr.
 Erde, Allan
 Fackler, Martin L., Jr.
 Faust, Kenneth J.
 Fenner, Henry E.
 Flagg, Richard S.
 Fout, Larry R.
 Gibson, Donald C.
 Giles, John H.
 Goodwin, Joel S.
 Gorman, Edward R.
 Griffin, Charles N., Jr.
 Gypson, Ward G., Jr.
 Hagan, Arthur D.
 Hanauer, Franklin A.
 Harkins, Hugh H.
 Harris, Boyd L.
 Hayen, Donald O.
 Heldt, Robert P.
 Henderson, John A., III
 Herman, Clifford M.
- Herring, John H.
 Howery, Stephen E.
 Hunsaker, Darrell H.
 Huntsinger, Larry A.
 James, David R., Sr.
 Johnson, Richard F.
 Jorgensen, Morton C., Jr.
 Joyce, Thomas H., III
 Kesler, Kelvin F.
 Kettering, Donald L.
 Kinney, Robert J.
 Lowsma, Henry B.
 Lynch, William F., Jr.
 Magenheimer, Richard J.
 McDermott, William M., Jr.
 McGuigan, Patrick M., Jr.
 Meaders, Robert H.
 Middlekauff, Robert K.
 Minser, Allen C.
 Morris, Arthur S., Jr.
 Morrison, Francis S.
 Murray, Wayne L.
 Noble, Richard F.
 Pare, Norman G.
 Plavcan, William G.
 Poole, Edward K.
 Price, Albert C.
 Pursch, Joseph A.
 Raffaelli, Nicholas R.
 Ragsdale, Julian L.
 Randels, Paul H.
 Reitman, Sanford
 Roe, Robert D.
 Romine, John S.
 Routledge, James A.
 Rowland, Thomas C., Jr.
 Rumble, Wilson B.
 Ryan, Richard M.
 Sablan, Ralph G.
 Schwinn, Raymond L.
 Scott, Augustus B.
 Sennett, Charlie O., Jr.
 Shute, Howard E.
 Simmons, William W.
 Smith, James W.
 Smith, John P.
 Solomon, Alexandre
 Swisher, Louis B., Jr.

Taylor, Thomas E.
Thomas, David F.
Thomas, Joseph J., Jr.
Tolmie, John D.
Tope, Stephen L., Jr.
Tyler, Paul E.
Usselman, James A.
Vanhove, Eugene D.
VanValkenburgh,
Wood G.

Vollman, Don B., Jr.
Walk, Donald R.
Warmolts, John R.
Warrender, William F.
Weglarz, Stanley S.
Wescott, John W.
Whatley, Theodore R.
Williams, Wilfred L.
Witt, Frederick J.
Zimble, James A.

Mlekush, Matt C.
Moger, Jack B.
Myers, Russell, Jr.
Nicholls, William H.
Oliver, Philip, Jr.
Phenix, Robert P.
Ruff, Lowell H., Jr.
Shafer, Willard G.
Skrinak, Vincent M.

Smith, Ralph A., III
Stallman, Thomas F.
Stedman, Ralph S., Jr.
Taglienti, Gene S.
Tate, Thomas N.
Weis, John M.
Westberg, Robert J.
Wile, Dorwin B.
Wilking, Richard P.

Donald R. Berg
Henry C. Bergmann
William F. Bethel
James H. Bird, Jr.
Harold L. Blanton, Jr.
Nicholas K. Bodnar
Charles F. Bogg
Walter F. Bowron
John R. Braddon
Albert E. Brewster, Jr.
Horace A. Bruce
William E. Bucher
John G. Buchman
William E. Buckon
William L. Buergey
Michael Burin
Richard H. Burnett
Richard R. Burritt
Richard A. Cash
Ernest C. Cheatham, Jr.

Donald E. Gunther
Bernard V. Gustitis
Harry T. Hagaman
Robert G. Haggard
William P. Haight
William J. Hallisey, Jr.
Herbert J. Harkey, Jr.
Gale Harlan
John B. Harris
Robert H. Harter
Richard L. Hatch
Francis J. Heath, Jr.
Robert W. Heesch
James F. Heisel
Joseph E. Hennegan
Charles W. Henry, Jr.
Clayton G. Herbert, Jr.
James H. Higgins
Rollin E. Hippler
Ervin E. Hodges
Charles W. Hoffner
Robert E. Hofstetter
William F. Hohmann
John S. Hollingshead
John S. Hollis
Preston E. Howell
Ernest A. Huerlimann, Jr.
Sidney A. Huguenin, Jr.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Allen, Samuel B., Jr.
Andersen, Elfi A.
Ardizzone, Joseph C.
Beals, Donald A.
Bedford, Arthur G.
Bennett, Charlie A., Jr.
Biddison, Ted A.
Blake, James F., Jr.
Brotherton, Curtis W.
Buehler, Cyril H.
Causbie, Edgar S.
Chrisman, Alfred B.
Clamp, Robert W.
Clark, Bryan L., Jr.
Clark, Davis L.
Collier, William G.
Cornwell, Stanley R.
Davis, Robert W.
Delleney, Jimmie S.
Dolloff, Robert H.
Douglass, Jerry B.
Dowling, Richard M.
Ellis, Richard W.
Erwin, Charles H.
Flood, Peter A.
Foreman, Clarence P., Jr.

Fulks, Logan G.
Gallaher, James H.
Graessle, Ernest J.
Hamilton, John F.
Hamilton, James W.
Hamilton, Michael H.
Hayes, Lester D., Jr.
Haynsworth, Hugh C., III

Henseler, Richard C.
Hirschy, Henry E., Jr.
Holder, James R.
Jones, Bobby J.
Kaiser, Robert A.
Killoan, Joel D.
Lampton, George H.
Leal, Milford A.
Lovell, Donald A.
Manley, Eugene T.
Mara, Ray A.
McLaughlin, Richard B.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Alexander, Don C.
Baxter, Roy A.
Brudzynski, Peter F.
Edwards, John R., Jr.
Elder, Robert M.
Gallagher, Bartholomew T.
Gately, Robert E.
Goffrier, Robert R.
Haney, John C., Jr.
Keeley, Patrick P.
Klapperich, Owen B.
Laurenzano, Roch M.
Lecky, Hugh F., Jr.
Lemasters, Clarence E.
Maritato, Victor J.

McGonigal, Richard A.
McGovern, Francis W.
McKee, Billy J.
Merritt, Milton E.
Milosek, William J.
Murphy, Michael A.
Neal, Aubrey M.
Norton, Lawrence E.
Parrish, Whitney W.
Paulson, Gordon E.
Pitts, Charles H.
Running, Paul H.
Smeland, Arthur L.
Tatum, Robert D.
Vernon, Clarence A.
Willson, William G.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Andress, Hyneman M.
Auerbach, Ralph W., Jr.
Bair, William A.
Barry, Richard P.
Brown, George H.
Burdick, William E.
Busche, Robert E.
Clark, Jerry L.

Conner, Donald L.
Donaldson, Jacques E.
Eager, Walter J., Jr.
Gibboney, Lloyd H.
Grinke, Walton J.
Hathaway, David B.
Hauck, John W.
Kramer, Robert L.
Lowe, Stephen D.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Anderson, Dale M.
Anderson, John W.
Blank, Byron E.
Brose, Mark O.
Butler, William D.
Chapman, Thom H.
Connole, Peter W.
Crawford, Benton E., Jr.
Daughtry, Max B.
Devos, Brice J.
Eastwood, Gerald W.
Gaston, David L.
George, Chester L.
Gourley, James V.
Grisius, Richard J.
Guarnieri, Lewis J.
Hall, Daniel L.
Harris, Ronald K.
Hart, Gerald L.
Hatrell, Paul P.
Hulse, Richard S.
Johnson, James I.
Kellner, Frank H.
Kennedy, Paul T.
Kimpel, William A.

Koch, Robert W.
Lusk, Samuel S.
Luton, Jonathan P., Jr.
McMurdock, Robert C., Jr.
Montgomery, Steve
Moore, Dorsey J.
Morse, Ronald P.
Nissenson, Marvin
Osetek, Edward M.
Preece, Richard G.
Reisman, Paul J.
Rogers, John D.
Rudolph, Jerome "J"
Shoemaker, "O" "L"
Smith, David J.
Stepnick, Robert J.
Stevens, John T.
Tracy, Norman H., Jr.
Trainor, John E.
Walkowiak, Gene J.
Weigel, Eugene J., Jr.
Werning, John T.
White, Warne H.
Williams, John P.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Andersen, Walter A.
Barker, Samuel D.
Coulson, Harold H.
Davies, John A.
DeCesaris, Chester A.
Devine, Robert G.
Dickerson, Kenneth H.
Floan, Kenneth F.
Forrester, George G., Jr.
Harvey, Billy D.
Herrin, James H.
Hockstein, Edwin S.
Jordan, Thurmon O.
Kendrick, Allison N.

McGehee, Thomas L.
Myers, John D.
Neuman, Richard
Passaglia, Martin, Jr.
Paxton, Arthur W.
Ramirez, Gale
Ruffin, Robert S.
Sanborn, Warren R.
Sims, John L.
Skidmore, Wesley D.
Smith, Dewey L., Jr.
Spahn, James A., Jr.
Stallings, Orlando
Tanner, Millard F.
Whitlock, William E.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Barrows, Anne C.
Bonner, Helen M.
Connors, Ann P.
Emter, Dorothy M.
Harcastle, Jeraldine N.
Hunt, Florence E.
Jacques, Nancy J.
Jones, Bernice E.
Kelly, Therese M.
Liu, Myrtle F.
Ludwig, Margaret M.
MacDowell, Nancy A.
Merritt, Patricia A.
Mullian, Sheila E.

Murphy, Loretta M.
Nagy, Bettye G.
Nester, Mary L.
Pickering, Julia E.
Portz, Patricia J.
Proto, Theresa M.
Russell, Jean C.
Sauer, Mary A.
Spence, Laura D.
Spencer, Lelah E.
Stender, Doris C.
Stevenson, Patricia A.
Stokely, Betty M.
Wahlstrom, Willa R.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Vincent A. Albers, Jr.
Dan C. Alexander
Albert N. Allen
Terence M. Allen
James O. Allison
Warren L. Ammentorp
William D. Anderson
Francis Andrillunas
Kermit W. Andrus
Leon N. Angelo
Glen S. Aspinwall
Donald R. Austgen
Earl W. Bailey
Garnett R. Bailey
James D. Bailey
Howard G. Balogh
Glen H. Barlow
Sydney H. Batchelder, Jr.
William H. Bates
Andrew D. Beach
Ray H. Bell
Charles M. Bengel, Jr.
Joseph P. Beno
William D. Benton

Jerry P. Chene
Frank A. Clark
Franklin W. Coates
Dwain A. Colby
Francis X. Colleton
Charles W. Collier
James F. Conlon
Gorton C. Cook
Howard L. Cook
Robert W. Cooney
Gregory A. Corliss
Gerald B. Cornwall
Frank P. Costello, Jr.
John W. Cottom
Richard W. Coulter
John V. Cox
Stanley D. Cox
George B. Crist
Richard L. Critz
Richard F. Daley
Jack W. Davis
Marvin E. Day
John M. Dean
Joseph Deprima
Victor R. Deschuytner
James G. Doss, Jr.
Francis E. Doud
Robert Drovodahl
Daniel M. Duffield, Jr.
John H. Dunn
Ronald P. Dunwell
Ronald P. Eckmann
Hans G. Edebohlis
Thomas C. Edwards
Earl T. Elstner
Rodolfo R. Enderle
Samuel E. Englehart
John T. Enoch
Thomas B. Epps, Sr.
Harold J. Field, Jr.
Ralph D. First
Lawrence W. Fisher
Edward F. Fitzgerald
John J. Flynn
Karl J. Fontenot, Jr.
David D. Francis
Hubert I. Frey
Donald J. Fulham
Robert A. Fuller
Malcolm C. Gaffen
Kenneth C. Garner
Vincent J. Gentile
Paul K. German, Jr.
Charles R. Gibson
Richard O. Gillick
James E. Gillis
Donald E. Gillum
Sam M. Gipson, Jr.
Robert F. Glancy
George O. Goodson, Jr.
John F. Gould, Jr.
Edward T. Graham, Jr.
Marcus J. Gravel
Alfred M. Gray, Jr.
Dwayne Gray
Thomas F. Gray
Johnny O. Gregerson
Thomas L. Griffin, Jr.
Frederick E. Grube
Gerald F. Guay

Maurice Hunter
Richard L. Hyland
John W. Irion, Jr.
Carl Johansen, Jr.
Edward C. Johnson
Floyd J. Johnson, Jr.
Frederick S. Johnson
Paul M. Johnston
Joseph F. Jones
Vernon E. Jones
Bernard A. Kaasmann
Raymond H. Kansler
Floyd A. Karker, Jr.
Harold J. Keeling
Thomas J. Kelly
Harold L. Kendrick
Hugh T. Kennedy
Ralph F. Kenyon
Richard J. Kern
Charles A. King, Jr.
James P. King
John A. Kinniburgh
James C. Klinedinst
Roy E. Krieger
Richard A. Kuci
Ray G. Kummerow
John S. Kyle
Edward A. Laning
George P. Lawler
George M. Lawrence, Jr.
Joseph R. Lepp
Robert W. Lewis
Clifford A. Lindell
Prentice A. Lindsay
Robert A. Lindsay
Homer L. Litzenberg, III
Stanley J. Loferski
John C. Love
Jackson R. Luckett
Ronald J. Lynch
Robert J. Lyons
Joseph A. Macinnis
James E. Maher, Jr.
Everett L. Malmgren
Martin F. Manning, Jr.
Paul A. Manning
Joseph J. Marron
Thomas E. Mattimoe
Edward K. Maxwell
John R. McCandless
John F. McCarthy, Jr.
Eugene C. McCarthy
Bertram W. McCauley
Frederick J. McEwan
Vincent P. McGlone
Robert W. McInnis
Philip G. McIntyre
Roland D. McKee

Norman E. McKonley
 Walter J. McManus
 David R. McMillan, Jr.
 Don A. Mickle
 Robert L. Milbrad
 Hubert E. Miller
 Donald L. Mitchell
 Ralph F. Moody
 Wendell P. Morgenthau
 Dean H. Morley
 Edward C. Morris
 Wilbur J. Morris
 Donald R. Navorska
 Charles L. Nesbitt
 Charles C. Newmark
 Bruce C. Ogilvie
 Arthur S. Ohlgren
 James H. Olds
 Joseph H. Oliver, Jr.
 Donald P. Ostlund
 Wilford E. Overgaard
 Evan L. Parker, Jr.
 Landon W. Parker
 Victor E. Patrick
 James R. Penny
 Horacio E. Perea
 Frank E. Petersen, Jr.
 Jimmie R. Phillips
 John Phillips
 Rhys J. Phillips, Jr.
 Bayard S. Pickett
 Earl F. Pierson, Jr.
 Paul P. Pirhalla
 James R. Plummer
 Gerald H. Polakoff
 Rollin R. Powell, Jr.
 Robert E. Presson
 Joseph V. Price
 Ronald M. Proudfoot
 Daniel J. Quick
 Thomas M. Reedy
 James R. Rehfus
 Martin B. Reilly
 Donald L. Rice
 Wesley H. Rice
 William E. Riley, Jr.
 Fred C. Rilling, Jr.
 George H. Ripley
 John F. Roche, III
 Carlo Romano
 Richard E. Romine
 William E. Rudolph

George V. Ruos, Jr.
 Dale W. Sanford
 Jacques L. Saul
 Melvin H. Sautter
 Joseph Scoppa, Jr.
 John A. Scott
 John E. Seissiger
 Rufus A. Seymour
 Harold G. Shaklee
 James L. Shanahan
 Arthur B. Shilan
 William D. Shippen
 Don J. Slee
 Conway J. Smith
 John K. Smola
 Bradley S. Snell
 Billy R. Standley
 Robert W. Stark
 Raymond B. Steele
 Melvin J. Steinberg
 John C. Studt
 Rudolf S. Sutter
 Robert E. Switzer
 Vernon L. Sylvester
 Richard D. Taber, Sr.
 Spencer F. Thomas
 William J. Thomas
 David S. Tolle
 John J. Tolnay
 Kyle W. Townsend
 Robert M. Tremmel
 Stanley G. Tribe, Jr.
 Frank P. Turner
 James R. Vandenzelen
 Billy F. Visage
 Henry R. Vitall
 Douglas A. Wagner
 Dallas R. Walker
 Phillip C. Walker
 Charles F. Wallace
 George W. Ward
 John E. Weber, Jr.
 Joseph K. Welland
 William Weise
 Joseph J. Went
 Walter A. Weston
 Albert Whalley
 Michael E. White
 George A. Wickman
 Kenneth W. Williams
 George M. Wilson
 Charles R. Winfield
 Lewis C. Witt
 Herbert L. Wright

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Donald D. Amick
 James L. Anderson
 Leslie P. Day
 Ernest L. Defazio
 John H. Dubois
 Joseph E. Mullen, Jr.

Jack W. Newman
 George A. Ridgway
 Richard F. Skinner
 Harold Sobol
 Joe Vuckovich

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

OCTOBER 16, 1967.
 I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.
 JOHN W. McCORMACK,
 Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be the Lord, who daily bears us up; He is our salvation.—Psalms 68: 19.

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, disturbed by the demanding duties of this disruptive day and pursued by the persistent problems of this present period we would pause again at the altar of prayer to remember that Thou art God, that this is our Father's world, and to remind ourselves that though the wrong seems oft so strong Thou art the ruler yet. In Thy strength we would be made strong, with Thy wisdom we would become wise, and by Thy grace we would face the tasks of this week with confidence.

We pray for our country—for our President, our Speaker, and all the leaders of our people. Rule their hearts and direct their endeavors that law and order, justice and peace may prevail everywhere in our land. Make us mighty in moving along right paths that we may be worthy of Thy blessing and in turn become a blessing to all nations, to the glory of Thy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 12, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli;
 H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Omer Penner;
 H.R. 1674. An act for the relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr.;
 H.R. 2477. An act for the relief of John J. McGrath;
 H.R. 6189. An act for the relief of Fred W. Kolb, Jr.;
 H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr.;
 H.R. 6666. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilyn Shorette;
 H.R. 7324. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo F. Mendez, doctor of medicine;
 H.R. 8254. An act for the relief of Jan Drobot; and
 H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8629. An act to amend the act of July 4, 1966 (Public Law 89-491).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint and concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 362. An act for the relief of Sofia Dorr;

S. 552. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to provide that committing acts dangerous to persons on board trains shall be a criminal offense;

S. 772. An act for the relief of Dr. Violeta V. Ortega Brown;

S. 948. An act for the relief of Seaman Eugene Sidney Markovitz, U.S. Navy;

S. 1147. An act for the relief of Mariana Mantzios;

S. 1395. An act for the relief of Dr. Brandia Don (nee Praschnick);

S. 1440. An act to include in the prohibitions contained in section 2314 of title 18, United States Code, the transportation with unlawful intent in interstate or foreign commerce of traveler's checks bearing forged countersignatures;

S. 1490. An act for the relief of Yang Ok Yoo (Maria Margurita);

S. 1556. An act for the relief of Dr. Orlando O. Lopez;

S. 1690. An act for the relief of Juan Andres Lliteras and his wife, Engracia Heydrich Bellido Lliteras;

S. 1808. An act for the relief of Miss Amalia Seresly;

S. 1828. An act for the relief of Susan Elizabeth (Cho) Long;

S. 1829. An act for the relief of Lisa Marie (Kim) Long;

S. 1865. An act, for the relief of Bertha Iturroz Arteché;

S. 1968. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Ernesto Garcia y Tojar;

S. 1979. An act for the relief of Carlos Fernandez;

S. 2005. An act for the relief of Dr. Anacleto C. Fernandez;

S. 2022. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Jose Ramirez DeEstenoz;

S. 2023. An act for the relief of Virgilio A. Arango, M.D.;

S. 2071. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio M. Tagle;

S. 2078. An act for the relief of Dr. Alberto DeJongh;

S. 2081. An act for the relief of Jacqueline Whang-Peng;

S. 2119. An act for the relief of Dr. Octavio Suarez-Murias;

S. 2121. An act to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims;

S. 2139. An act for the relief of Dr. Angel Trejo Padron;

S. 2167. An act for the relief of Dr. Rolando Pozo y Jimenez;

S. 2176. An act for the relief of Dr. Edgar Reinaldo Nunez Baez;

S. 2178. An act for the relief of Dennis W. Radtke;

S. 2192. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael de la Portilla Lavastida;

S. 2200. An act for the relief of Homer T. Williamson, Sr.;

S. 2216. An act to establish a National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works;

S. 2303. An act to provide a uniform system for fixing and adjusting the pay of employees in recognized trades or crafts, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period comprising the first full week in October of each year as "Spring Garden Planting Week"; and

S. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of certain hearings of the Special Committee on Aging.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my